The American
Political Science Review

VOL. XLVII SEPTEMBER, 1953 NO. 3

RESEARCH IN COMPARATIVE POLITICS

The Report that follows embodies the general conclusions of the members of the Social Science Research Council's Interuniversity Research Seminar on Comparative Politics, held at Northwestern University in the summer of 1952. It is a detailed summarization of the daily conferences held as well as of individual papers prepared by the participants. The Report was jointly prepared by Roy Macridis and Richard Cox. Members of the Seminar were: Samuel H. Beer and Harry Eckstein, Harvard University; George I. Blanksten and Roy Macridis (Chairman), Northwestern University; Karl W. Deutsch, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Kenneth W. Thompson, University of Chicago, and Robert E. Ward, University of Michigan; Richard Cox of the University of Chicago acted as rapporteur. Several other persons participated in some of the meetings, but responsibility for the Report is assumed by the authors and members of the Seminar.

The comments by Carl J. Friedrich, Harold D. Lasswell, Herbert A. Simon, Ralph J. D. Braibanti, G. Lowell Field, and Dwight Waldo were prepared at the invitation of the editors. (*Ed.*)

SEMINAR REPORT*

The study of comparative politics has been primarily concerned thus far with the study of the formal institutions of governments—particularly the governments of Western Europe. It has been in this sense not only parochial but also primarily descriptive and formalistic. Its place in the field of political science, while suffering from all the ambiguities and methodological inadequacies of the field in general, has been ill-defined. Is the student of comparative politics primarily concerned with the meticulous description of the formal institutions of various polities or is it his role to undertake comparison? If the latter, what is the meaning of comparison? Is it confined simply to the description of *differences* among various institutional arrangements? Does comparison stop when we note that England has had a two-party system whereas France has had a multi-party system? Does a description of the institutional arrangements of the Soviet Union reveal in any sense the most relevant factors that account for the differences between it and Western democracies? If comparison is to be something more than the descriptive portrait of formal institutional differences, what should be its aim, scope, and method? Should the student of comparative politics attempt to compare total configurations? If not, then he has to develop a precise notion of what can be isolated from the total configuration of a system or systems and compared, i.e., understood and explained with reference to similar patterns wrenched from the total configuration of another system.

---

* A Summary of the Report appeared in *Items,* Vol. 6, pp. 45-49 (Dec., 1952)

The above questions illustrate the difficulties and the challenge confronting the student of comparative politics. His scope of observation and the data available to him exceed by far in richness and variety the materials in the laboratory of any chemist or physicist. His drawback, on the other hand, has been primarily intellectual. He does not know what to do with his material. He may not know under what categories to classify it and, insofar as he does, he is confronted with the further task of drawing meaningful relations between observable phenomena and testing these relationships. When he attempts to draw such relationships in the form of hypotheses he is confronted with grave questions. Can a hypothesis be verified or disproved? Here the admonition of the natural scientists that strictly speaking one cannot verify a hypothesis but only falsify it gives us no comfort. What we are primarily concerned with is our ability to find analogous patterns of relationships on the basis of which we may, with assurance, state that such and such a hypothesis is disproved. A second source of concern, very similar to the first, is our notion of causality. Is it possible to isolate a single variable, or even a series of variables, and consider them as being conditioning factors or causal factors with respect to a particular consequence? It may well be, for instance, that a series of factors comprised of figures on marriage, cost of living, and literacy can be related in two or more systems with the number of votes cast in a series of national elections. Is the relationship causal or purely fortuitous? How can we find out?

The problem of comparative method revolves around the discovery of uniformities, i.e., the analytical formulation of concepts and problems under which real institutional forms can be compared. But if so, what are the particular clusters of states that have the desired degree of "uniformity" that makes comparison and understanding of variations possible? Does the concept of area, as used by cultural anthropologists, provide us with such hunting ground for the study of differences against a background of uniformity? Or does the similarity of certain social elements (i.e., similar kinship systems) or economic elements (i.e., similar occupational structures) give us a better chance to compare and understand variations? What degree of homogeneity is required for comparison and, by the same token, are comparisons impossible between systems which do not show the desired degree of homogeneity? How similar ought systems to be and in what special respects (either in a real or in an analytical sense), if we are meaningfully to compare their institutions and political processes?

It was with questions such as these that the Seminar members were primarily concerned. To begin with, it was generally admitted that comparative politics as conceived today, in research as well as in teaching, fails to raise—let alone answer—such questions. It has been primarily parochial in its emphasis upon Western systems. It has been descriptive in depicting, as accurately as possible, only formal institutions of the Western states, and, with rare exceptions, it has been insensitive to hypothesizing. Even its descriptive emphasis has been misplaced. For it has stressed primarily the formal legal institutions, such as constitutions, legislatures, judicial systems, and the like, which in a majority of the non-Western political systems yield no insights into the realities of political processes.

On the other hand, it was readily admitted that it would be extremely ambitious in a short period of time to attempt to answer in detail the methodological questions involved in the study of comparative politics and *at the same time* to make a beginning in coming to grips with the substantive work of empirical research. It was felt that if we could do some spade-work on the methodological issues we would achieve something significant in two respects: First, by raising the methodological questions we would invite comments and suggestions from the members of the profession and thus hope to raise the general level of methodological sophistication and speculation; secondly, by stating our own position or positions with reference to method we hoped, even at the expense of having our point of view sharply challenged, to make a definite contribution to methodological reflection in the field and to increase the awareness of the need for taking some kind of methodological position *prior to or along with the collection and descriptive enumeration of facts.*

In the 19th century students of politics indulged primarily in theories and normative speculations. Today we have many facts but we do not know why we have them and we are unable to decide what to do with them. By agreeing on a scheme of inquiry, or upon alternative schemes of inquiry, therefore, we hope *to elicit empirical research and investigation which will be systematically oriented* to the major problems of the field.

I. COMPARABILITY VS. UNIQUENESS

A number of meetings were devoted to the general theoretical problem of "comparability" and its relations to "uniqueness." The question was raised as to the proper way in which valid comparisons between different political systems can be made. Is it possible to make comparisons between various elements abstracted from their respective political systems? Or can the political scientist "understand" an institution or process *only* within the total context (social, economic, and cultural) in which it occurs? If the latter is the case, does it not make questionable—or perhaps even impossible—any real "comparative" politics? On the other hand, granting the possibility of making at least limited comparisons, what is the best manner in which to proceed? At what *levels* of comparison are political scientists equipped to proceed today?

It was suggested, for one thing, that the general problem of comparison is extraordinarily difficult for political science, since it is unlikely that we will ever find a true "experimental" situation, that is, two or more societies which are identical in all respects except for a single, variable factor. Consequently, the possibility of comparing one variable or even a set of variables against identical conditions is illusory. It would seem that we must resort to comparison—at different levels of abstraction and complexity—of wider or narrower segments of the political process.

In the area of actual *comparison,* a tentative classification of *levels* of comparative analysis was suggested:

1. Comparison of a single problem limited to political systems which are 'sufficiently' homogeneous in character and operation.
2. Comparison of several elements or clusters of elements in relation to political systems which are 'fairly' homogeneous.
3. Comparison of institutions or segments of the political process irrespective of homogeneity.
4. Comparison of political systems as such.

These four levels of comparison require increasingly high levels of abstraction as one moves towards a general comparison of political systems. In the latter case, some such conceptual approach as that of "ideal types" would seem to be called for.

Approaching the question of comparability and uniqueness from a somewhat different angle, it was suggested that a general theory for comparison would have to (1) make explicit the criteria of relevance and interest by which one is to determine "What questions shall I ask about political systems?" and "What hypotheses shall I elaborate?", and (2) provide techniques for testing and extrapolation, on the basis of the generally comparable elements of different systems.

In essence such criteria would call for the formulation of an adequate set of problems, the elaboration of useful hypotheses about them, the development of techniques for testing these hypotheses, and, finally, the development of techniques for applying the test to actual material. Comparative study here will help point to the bearing one concrete fact may have upon others.

A discussion related to the "criteria of relevance" elicited two points of view: On the one hand, it was suggested that in order to determine in a systematic way (a) what problems should be studied; (b) the "depth" of investigation necessary for their field study; and (c) the general area within which comparability was possible—"criteria of relevance" should be decided on the basis of a general theory of a conceptual scheme. On the other hand, it was argued that the criteria of relevance can be decided only in terms of formulations of ad hoc problems.

It should be made clear, however, that in both cases relevance will be decided by the investigator. In the first case relevance arises from the a priori formulations for relations. The investigator is looking for some relations and not for others. In the second case, relevance is derived from the need to solve concrete problems.

This question of "criteria of relevance" was felt to be especially acute in the relation of political factors to social, economic, or religious factors. By what method can the political scientist determine how far to go in *depth* when dealing with the interrelations of these various factors, either generally or in terms of specific problems? Once again, one viewpoint expressed was the necessity to devise a general "typological" scheme by which to delimit the number and depth of criteria to be considered; on the other hand, it was pointed out that there is no general formula of a scientific nature by which to decide this question. It was felt that criteria of relevance can be established through a "pragmatic" approach, and this, in turn, depends on (1) the scope and the type of the problem involved; (2) the purpose for which one wants the information to be obtained; and (3) the investigator's experience, general knowledge, and feeling ('scientific intuition') for the problem.

One factor which was said to complicate the problem of comparability is the contention that the concept of "causality" for the physical sciences appears to be applicable only in a limited and modified way when dealing with social phenomena. In this connection, it was pointed out that statistical correlations, for instance, can be helpful or meaningless, depending on the type of factors being analyzed, and on the degree to which the analysis proceeds to relate statistical patterns to "qualitative" factors and "degrees" of relevance—such as the nature of the motivations which have produced a statistically observable pattern of actions.

An alternative suggestion was that instead of referring to causality or looking for causality, it might be adequate simply to *interrelate* various social and political factors. This in essence means that appropriate relationships, if discoverable because of their frequent recurrence, entitle us to refer to causality simply in terms of statistical probability.

Another approach suggested as a general method of comparing political systems was the following: The initial stage of investigation may proceed by the "dismemberment" of each system under comparison, in order to isolate and analyze the important elements within each system (i.e., political parties, the bureaucracy, the legislature). Then follows the attempt to compare them. By a detailed examination of the separate elements within the system, the attention of the investigator is drawn to the specific differences between the elements in different systems as well as to the similarities. A further extension of this approach consists in relating the specific character of an institution to the historical background and psychological traits of the people concerned. Having examined in detail the specific elements of the different systems, the next step is to "reintegrate" the dismembered elements into a functioning, interrelated whole. This calls for an analysis of the relationships of the main organs and institutions to each other. The analysis may proceed on the basis of the following *check-points*, to be modified according to the conditions brought to light by empirical investigation:

1. The religious character of the society.
2. The political value patterns of the society.
3. The history of authority types in the political system.
4. Evaluation of the groups or types which are honored, and of the actions and manners of acquiring prestige.
5. Geographic conditions and their impact on the policy and its operations
    a. size
    b. communications
    c. population: density, distribution
6. Class composition and social structure, especially in relation to their impact on politics.
7. Educational system.

8. Nature of the economy.
9. The general "ethos" of the people, as discovered in its literature, etc.

The Problem of Comparability in Relation to the Study of Values. One important facet of the study of comparative government is the study of the values or value-systems held by various societies. One possible mode of comparison between political systems is that of discovering uniformities in values (national ethos or national character) first, and then comparing the differences of political institutions. However, it was pointed out: (1) that the existence of an integrated national ethos is doubtful, and (2) that even if such an ethos exists it does not have an operational value for the study of comparative politics.

One example cited as an attempt to deal with this problem of value-systems and national character was a study made of the reaction of five different culture groups to constitutional forms of government. These groups were located in New Mexico. The specific question under investigation was this: How are the constitutional forms of government *reinterpreted* in terms of the culture of the group which comes into contact with these forms? The actual results of field work showed, in the case of all five groups, that no really integrated pattern of values appeared. There appeared to be only *clusters* of values within each group, which would seem to negate the idea of discovering a general "national character" or "ethos" on the basis of which high-level comparisons could be made possible. This result brought into question the reliability of any attempt to plot the total impact of constitutional forms on the "ethos" of each group. Instead, a more modest approach was suggested, namely, the examination of the reaction to selective, limited, and fairly concrete institutions and processes, such as legislatures, parties, and elective systems. In other words, instead of looking for an ethos and then relating it to processes and institutions, one should compare the reactions to limited and concrete values in each one of the selected societies.

On the question of examining "values," the same kind of contrasting viewpoints regarding the setting of the problems and "criteria of relevance" appeared as had appeared in other discussions of the general problem of comparability. Some members of the group held that the value-problems to be studied should be set in terms of specific *problems*, and that the criteria of relevance for the study can be set only in terms of the scope and nature of the value to be examined, in its relationship to the specific cultural setting. Here again, doubt was expressed as to the possibility and desirability of deriving the approach to the study of values from a general conceptual framework. An intermediate view suggested the possibility of operating not on the basis of a general scheme or single values, but rather on the basis of a "configuration" approach which would deal with the reaction of societies to selected interrelated value patterns.

The number of points of view expressed and the apparent inconclusiveness of the discussion on the question of comparability and uniqueness indicate, if nothing else, the complexity of the problem and the lack of any existing systematic treatment. Two major points of view were expressed: one arguing in favor of the need of a conceptual scheme which not only spells out the categories under which data may be collected, but also indicates the criteria of relevance to be adopted and the variables which are to be related hypothetically for the purpose of comparison and ultimately for the development of a theory; the other arguing that, given the present state of comparative studies, comparability ought to be derived primarily from the formulation of problems within limited and manageable proportions. The extent of this disagreement should not, however, obscure the area of agreement reached by the members of the Seminar. It was agreed:

1. That comparison involves abstraction and that concrete situations or processes can never be compared as such. Every phenomenon is unique; every manifestation is unique; every process, every nation, like every individual, is in a sense unique. To compare them means to select certain types or concepts, and in so doing we have to "distort" the unique and the concrete.

2. That prior to any comparison it is necessary not only to establish categories and concepts but also to determine criteria of relevance of the particular components of a social and political situation to the problem under analysis (i.e., relevance of social stratification to family system, or sun spots to political instability).

3. That it is necessary to establish criteria for the adequate representation of the particular components that enter into a general analysis or the analysis of a problem.

4. That it is necessary in attempting to develop ultimately a theory of politics to formulate hypotheses emerging either from the context of a conceptual scheme or from the formulation of a problem.

5. That the formulation of hypothetical relations and their investigation against empirical data can never lead to proof. A hypothesis or a series of hypothetical relations would be considered proven, i.e., verified, only as long as it withstands falsification.

6. That hypothetical series rather than single-hypotheses should be formulated. In each case the connecting link between general hypothetical series and the particular social relations should be provided by the specification of conditions under which any or all the possibilities enumerated in this series are expected to take place.

The formulation of hypothetical series, it should be pointed out, unlike a single hypothesis (which states what consequence will flow from a given antecedent state X), states series of consequences which will flow from state X or several states X, Y, Z under particular conditions. It is designed to deal with the problem of verification in social sciences, where the absence of experimental situations prevents us from having sufficiently constant situations to determine the role played in them by specified variables. Under such circumstances we can only state hypotheses for varying conditions, i.e., hypothetical series. The specification of such conditions is what gives us a meaningful element of regularity in the absence of experimental situations and allows us to test our hypotheses by finding not only similar but also dissimilar consequences ensuing from given antecedent conditions.

7. That comparative study, even if it falls short of providing a general theory of politics, can pave the way to the gradual and cumulative development of theory by (a) enriching our imaginative ability to formulate hypotheses, in the same sense that any "outsidedness" enhances our ability to understand a social system; (b) providing a means for the testing of hypotheses, and (c) making us aware that something we have taken for granted requires explanation.

8. Finally, that one of the greatest dangers in hypothesizing in connection with comparative study is the projection of possible relationships ad infinitum. This can be avoided by the orderly collection of data prior to hypothesizing. Such collection may in itself

lead us to the recognition of irrelevant relations (climate and the electoral system, language and industrial technology, etc.). Such a recognition in itself makes for a more manageable study of data. *Hence the importance attached by the members of the Seminar to the development of some rough classificatory scheme prior to the formulation of hypotheses.*

The members of the Seminar generally rejected the arguments made in favor of uniqueness, and argued that comparison between institutions not only can be made, but also may eventually provide—through types of approach to be indicated presently—a general theory of politics as well as a general theory of political change. Before such general theories can be developed, however, research along the following lines must be undertaken in as orderly a way as possible:

(1) Elaboration of a tentative classificatory scheme, however rough;

(2) Conceptualization at various levels of abstraction (preferably at the more modest and manageable level of the problem-oriented approach);

(3) Hypothesizing, i.e., the formulation of single hypotheses or hypothetical series suggested either by the data ordered under a classificatory scheme or by the formulation of sets of problems; and

(4) Finally, the constant testing of hypotheses by empirical data in order to eliminate untenable hypotheses by falsification, making possible the formulation of new and more valid ones.

It is regrettable that none of these approaches have been seriously and methodically used by political scientists. Classification is spotty, and, in most cases, of descriptive, formal character. Conceptualization and hypothesizing have not moved beyond the narrow-gauge problem-approach state—and this with reference to the Western European countries primarily. As for a systematic process for the verification and falsification of hypotheses, it remains practically unknown in our literature.

II. APPROACH SUGGESTED

Formulation of a Conceptual Scheme. Concern with systematic formulation of a scheme for empirical inquiry led the Seminar members to a discussion of the need of a conceptual scheme for the comparative study of politics as an introduction to a general, i.e., comparative theory of politics. It was felt that the formulation of such a scheme would (a) help provide classificatory concepts, and (b) make the ordered elaboration of hypotheses possible. Such a conceptual scheme, it was agreed, was not designed to spell out a "theory"—an objective too ambitous indeed to be accomplished in the seven weeks that the Seminar members had at their disposal. We simply wanted to indicate the role of such a scheme in the formulation of a theory in the future—i.e., in the elaboration of relationships in the form of hypotheses and ultimately the systematic formulation of a series of hypotheses that can be tested comparatively against various political systems.

Comparison, it was agreed, must proceed on the basis of a definition which views politics as a universally discoverable social function or activity. The function of politics, in the total social system, is to provide society with social decisions having the force and status of legitimacy. A social decision has the "force of legitimacy" if the collective regularized power of the society is brought to bear against deviations and if there is a predominant disposition among those subject to the decision to comply. As for the means of enforcing decisions, every society, generally speaking, has a determinate organization which enjoys a monopoly of legitimate authority (or *political ultimacy*). Moreover, the distinguishing characteristic between political relationships and other will relationships is the existence of this framework of legitimacy. Concepts of legitimacy or "legitimacy myths" are the highly varied ways in which people justify coercion, conformity, and the loss of political ultimacy to some superior groups or persons, as well as the ways by which a society rationalizes its ascription of political ultimacy and the beliefs which account for a predisposition to compliance with social decisions.

But the legitimacy myth only defines the conditions of obedience. Within its framework, there is the political process itself, through which numerous political aspirations (policy aspiration groups and power aspiration groups) strive for recognition and elevation to the position of legitimacy. The factors which determine *which* power aspiration group is to be invested with legitimacy, to the exclusion of all others, are the effective power factors of the system. This, in brief, was the general conception of "politics" on which we worked.

It was suggested, then, that on the basis of the terms and framework here outlined the general modes of politics, for the purpose of analysis, would be as follows: political processes are the struggles among power aspiration and policy aspiration groups competing for the status of legitimacy; the outcome of such struggles is determined by the society's structure of effective power; and the end state, legitimacy, is the political reflection of its general value system.

The major components of the political process which should provide a fairly coherent classification scheme as well as the possibility of formulating hypothetical relations are the following:

1. The 'elective' process of the system, both formal and informal.
2. Its 'formal' deliberative process.
3. Its 'informal' deliberative process.
4. Its structure of 'influence.'
5. Its structure of 'power.'

Finally, the major tasks (as they are envisioned under this scheme) in the analysis of political systems are these:

1. To analyze the legitimacy myth of the society, in terms of its specific content and its relationship to the society's general myth structure.
2. To inquire into the system's
    a. political aspirations
    b. political processes
    c. effective power factors
3. To analyze both the complexity and ultimacy of decision-making systems in any given society:
    a. the conditions under which political ultimacy is either diffused or concentrated.
    b. the relationships between subsidiary and ultimate decision-making systems.
4. To formulate general hypotheses about this aspect of politics and the relationship between them.

5. To provide for a theory of change through the study of tension between 'formal' and 'informal' processes.

Criticism of the Concepts Involved in the Scheme. Following the presentation of this introduction to a conceptual scheme, a series of meetings was devoted to discussions of the main concepts; criticisms were offered, and alternative definitions or methods of analysis were suggested by the various members of the Seminar group.

1. The definition of politics in terms of decision-making and legitimacy myths was questioned. It was felt by some of the members that the emphasis upon decision-making as the most significant and uniform aspect of politics meant a narrowing of the accepted meaning of politics.

2. It was also pointed out that the concept of decision-making failed to cover adequately traditional subjects which are generally considered to be part of politics, i.e., international politics, war, colonial and military government. Moreover, it was felt by some that the concept of decision-making does not deal adequately with such modes of political behavior as (a) sheer coercive power relations; (b) fear and its attending consequences in politics; and (c) apathy to the political sphere of social activity.

3. Some of the group were of the opinion that the concept of the legitimacy myth needed some clarification in order to be made operationally useful. It was suggested therefore that the legitimacy myth concept be viewed as an amalgam of four operational concepts: (a) habitual acquiescence; (b) the partial internalization of command; (c) self-involvement; and (d) structural transfer to other social stereotypes.

4. Another general criticism made was to the effect that the concepts of decision-making and of legitimacy myths are primarily applicable to Western political systems. In order to provide a rough test of the general applicability of the scheme, a number of areas and problems were selected for examination.

III. ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES

The general agreement on the usefulness and desirability of a conceptual scheme was coupled with an equally strong emphasis on the need of alternative approaches. It was felt that the conceptual scheme presented and discussed in the Seminar was adequate for *purposes of illustration* and that the present state of comparative politics called for a "pluralistic" rather than unitary approach.

From here on the Seminar decided to develop and discuss alternative approaches to the study of comparative politics. It was agreed, however, that for each one of the alternative approaches to be suggested, the same or at least comparable precision as that involved in the development of a conceptual scheme or a classificatory scheme should be insisted upon. Any and all of the alternative approaches, it was pointed out, should establish at lower levels of abstraction and comprehensiveness a conceptual categorization for the compilation of data and should also lead to the elaboration of meaningful hypotheses. If our concerns are similar, we can develop a common language, we may begin to look for facts under common headings and concepts, and we may start asking for or pointing to hypothetical relations and attempt to apply them in different contexts, in various countries, and at different levels of abstraction and inclusiveness.

The alternative approaches on which we agreed were: (1) the *problem approach* to comparative politics; (2) the *area approach* to the study of comparative politics; (3) an amplification of the classificatory scheme approach in the form of a *check-list* to aid us in the more coherent and more systematic compilation of data.

The "Problem Approach" to Comparative Politics. Comparative politics cannot wait for the development of a general, i.e., comparative theory and of a general comprehensive conceptual scheme. Therefore, instead of making claims of comprehensiveness and universality, would it not be preferable to suggest a more modest and manageable approach? The members of the Seminar agreed that the problem approach could perform such a function. It was pointed out that the formulation of a problem has in itself some of the characteristics of a conceptual scheme. The presentation and the formulation of problems requires an ordering of empirical data and calls for the formulation of hypotheses or series of hypothetical relations. Furthermore, the problem approach is flexible enough so that it can lead the research worker to an examination of problems with a varying degree of comprehensiveness both in terms of theory and in terms of empirical orientation and investigation. Three types of problem approaches were suggested and discussed:

1. The area of narrow-range theory. Narrow-range theory involves a relatively low degree of abstraction, i.e., it applies to homogeneous cultural contexts, and deals with a limited number of variables.

2. The area of middle-range theory. Middle-range theory is conceived to include problems of fairly general importance, involving a relatively high degree of generalization, but which remain below the level of a truly general theory of politics.

The subject matter of problems included within these two ranges should *ultimately* be integrated into a general political theory. They are resorted to for the sake of making problems manageable in terms of existing data and techniques we can hope to acquire.

3. Policy-oriented theory and problems. Policy-oriented theory is that area which deals with the immediate practical solution of important problems and is consequently focused on problems derived from pressing conflict situations or any overwhelming need for action at the governmental level. Naturally the question arose as to what criteria should be used to select the problems. Four such criteria were suggested: (a) The intrinsic interest of the problem to members of the profession; (b) the relevance of the problem to the elimination of certain key difficulties in the comparative method and the analytical utility of comparison; (c) the ability of the problem to take us beyond the current level of inquiry in the field; (d) the probable and eventual significance of the problem in leading us to the formation of a general theory of comparative politics.

It was agreed that the formulation of the problem should be as clear and logically coherent as possible. A problem selected should be presented in the following form:

(1) The statement and structure of the problem: The problem must be stated precisely; it must be stated in such a form as to lead immediately to hypotheses; it must be analyzed into its component elements; its variables and the relations between them must be spelled out; and all this must be done in operationally meaningful terms.

(2) Its relations to a possible general theory of politics: that is, how would the problem

fit into a more general theoretical orientation, and what more general questions can illuminate its solution.

(3) Demonstration of the manner in which the problem calls for the use of comparative method, and analysis of the level of abstraction which comparison would involve.

(4) The enumeration of a recommended research technique for dealing with the problem and justification of the recommendation.

(5) The enumeration of possible alternative research techniques.

Though it was generally agreed that it was not the function of our Seminar to state exhaustively narrow-range, middle-range, and policy-oriented problems, a few typical ones were suggested for the purpose of illustration:

1. In the realm of narrow-range theory—an analysis of the relations between the power of dissolution and ministerial stability in parliamentary systems.
2. In the realm of middle-range theory—a study of the political consequences of rapid industrialization in underdeveloped areas of the world.
3. In the realm of policy-oriented problems:
    a. The development of constitutional governments in colonial areas.
    b. How to deal with political instability in France.
    c. How to dissociate colonial nationalism from Soviet-inspired leadership and ideology.
    d. What should the policy of constitutional regimes be toward the totalitarian parties, e.g., the Communist party?

It was, however, felt very strongly by all members of the group that extensive cooperative research should be undertaken for the purpose of formulating as systematically as possible various sets of problems of the middle-range, narrow-range, and policy-oriented types before undertaking cooperative empirical investigation. If the problems are set in an interrelated fashion and if the narrow-gauge problems are made to fit into the middle-range problems, the research carried out in the future not only will have the advantage of being coherent but may also pave the way to the elaboration of more comprehensive problematic approaches and ultimately to the tentative formulation of conceptual schemes and theories.

Classificatory Scheme and a Check-List of Politics. The discussion of the need for a classificatory scheme and the existence of check-lists in related social sciences led the members of the Seminar to the conclusion that a political check-list may fill a very serious gap in the literature today. Such a list may provide for a clear and coherent table of classification under which data can be assembled in an orderly fashion under commonly formulated concepts.

A detailed elaboration of such a check-list and the arrangement of data under it is, however, an immense task. The members of the Seminar felt, as was the case with the problem approach, that such an undertaking requires a cooperative effort among groups of social scientists. Nevertheless, we decided to develop, for purposes of illustration only and in brief outline form, such a check-list. The following broad categories and subdivisions were included:

1. The setting of politics (an enumeration of the most significant contextual factors of all political systems, i.e., geographic patterning, economic structure, transportation and communication patterns, sociological structure and minorities, cultural patterns, values and value systems, and the record of social change).

2. The sphere of politics: the actual and potential sphere of political decisions (conditions determining the sphere of decision-making; limits on political decisions; major types of decision-making; and potential changes in the sphere of decision-making).

3. Who makes decisions—the elite. (Who are they supposed to be? To whom does the community impute prestige and what are the prevalent prestige images and symbols? Forms of selection of political elites—ascription, achievement. Who actually makes the effective political decisions if they differ from those who are supposed to make them? By what means? The breakdown of elites: regional, etc. Stability of the elite. Types of personal participation in the decision-making process.)

4. How decisions are made (formulation of problems; agencies and channels of decision-making; decision-making procedure; some major characteristics of decision-making procedure.)

5. Why are decisions obeyed? (The enforcement of decisions; compliance; consent; types of consent; the sociology of compliance; some check-points for the measurement of compliance.)

6. Practical politics: policy aspiration groups and power aspiration groups. (Policy aspiration groups: types, purpose, organization, techniques. Power aspiration groups: types, goals, organization, techniques, influence and effectiveness.)

7. The performance of the system: stability, adjustment, and change.
    a. Conditions of stability and change (legitimacy myth, relationship between formal and informal processes). Manifestations of instability and stability (legitimacy myth, formal or informal processes). Allocation of decision-making power (leadership); some check points for stability and instability.
    b. Change (conditions of; manifestation; types; check-points for assessing conditions for potential change).

The Area Study and Comparative Politics. A third alternative approach to the study of comparative politics is the more systematic and precise use of the *area concept.* The members of the group felt that the concept has been abused in the organization of university studies. The expression "world areas," though of some use, lacks operational clarity and consistency. It was agreed also that the concept of area has been somewhat indiscriminately associated with the following concepts either separately or in combination: (1) geographic: the definition of an area simply because of the geographic propinquity of certain states, i.e., Western Europe, or the Far East; (2) historical: the definition of an area in the light of a common historical task and common historical experience; (3) economic: the definition of an area in the light of comparable economic conditions and needs; and (4) cultural: the definition of an area in the light of common cultural heritage or common experience of cultural inter-actions between two or more cultures.

It was generally felt that all of the above definitions are for the political scientist unsatisfactory. Neither geographic, historical, economic, nor cultural similarities constitute prima facie evidence of the existence of similar political characteristics. But if the concept of an area is to be operationally meaningful for the purpose of comparison, it should correspond to some uniform political patterns against which differences may be studied comparatively and explained.

The definition of an area on the basis of culture was considered to be worth detailed discussion. It was suggested that though primarily used by the anthropologists it might be adapted to the needs of the political scientists. Its use promises the following advantages for the political scientist:

1. A greatly heightened awareness of the multiple connections between the sphere of politics and other aspects of a culture, which may be described as a feeling for total context and for the overall integration and patterning of cultures.
2. An incentive to the adoption of an inter-disciplinary approach and the utmost possible utilization of the knowledge and skills of allied disciplines. It thus attempts to raise the student's methodological equipment to a level and potency more compatible with the dimensions of his problems.
3. A framework for political comparison across national and cultural boundaries far more realistic and meaningful than that supplied by the partial and out-of-context institutional framework generally utilized.
4. An awareness of the shortcomings of political explanations couched in terms of single-factor and proximate level causality and an impulsion to go more deeply into the complex ranges of social causality.
5. Some aid in avoiding the purely descriptive approach to political institutions and some incentive towards its replacement by a problem-oriented approach.
6. As effective a counterbalance to the irrational effects of ethnocentrism as a determinant of "proper" areas of interest and terms of appraisal as has been discovered.

Granting these advantages, however, it was pointed out that the concept of culture has been used by anthropologists as a static device for classifying cultural types and arranging data primarily in respect to primitive cultural units over a large and disparate geographic area. Furthermore, the concept of culture as used by other social scientists, e.g., ethnographers, becomes ambiguous and comes perilously close to being identifiable with the national characteristic or the "gestalt" or "ethos" approaches, which are operationally unacceptable to political scientists.

To make the concept operationally meaningful, therefore, for political science, it was suggested that an attempt be made to define areas with reference to "political traits" or "trait complexes" or "problem configuration patterns," in terms analogous to those used by the anthropologists when they break down the concept of culture into "traits" or "trait complexes." Such an approach to the definition of an area has not, as yet, been undertaken, despite its promise for comparative study. First, the very search for common political traits and problem configuration patterns will call for classification and conceptualization. Secondly, once similar traits or patterns have been distinguished and have been related to certain geographically delimited units, the area concept will be of great value, since certain political processes will be compared between units within the area against a common background of similar trait configuration. In this sense it was felt that future research should be directed towards developing in great detail classificatory schemes within areas. With the help of such a scheme the study of differences would be made far more manageable. For instance, it was felt that in Latin America the following problems offer the prospect of a fruitful intra-area comparison:

1. Political instability and "revolution."
2. Constitutional problems—the relation of written constitution to the actual operation of government in Latin American states.

3. Dictatorship—the typical character of Latin American dictatorships, and their differences from the European brand of totalitarianism.
4. Militarism—the extent and nature of military rule in Latin American politics.
5. Regionalism and particularism—the reasons underlying politically centrifugal tendencies.
6. International politics—the major factors which affect the role played by Latin American states in world politics and in international organizations.

Similar types of problems could easily be suggested for the Middle East, Scandinavia, and Western Europe.

Another general definition of an area which might be of use to political scientists included five operational criteria: (1) inter-action of values and ideas (culture); (2) physical proximity; (3) economic relations; (4) political inter-action of power relations and power groups; and (5) strategic considerations. These criteria have the advantage of pointing to the most important factors that enter into the area concept. The political scientist, however, has to relate them to similarities and dissimilarities in the observable political processes and attempt to explain them through the formulation of hypotheses.

IV. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND COMPARATIVE POLITICS

The last topic discussed by the group was the relationship between comparative politics and international politics. The contemporary study of international politics, it was pointed out, has actually entered a new stage. Prior to and during the First World War, the predominant emphasis was on diplomatic history. There followed a popularizing or "current events" phase, in which the attempt was made to treat every aspect of international affairs as an important segment of the study of international relations. The third stage has been that of the study—and it is a vast one—of international law and organization. But only in the later inter-war period, and since World War II, has there been an explicit attempt to formulate a general theory of *international politics.*

In this latest phase, there have been three significant developments: First, we have witnessed the evolution and development of a point of focus or core in the field; secondly, there have been the first faint and feeble beginnings of attempts to create an appropriate methodology for the field, or at least to determine those related methodologies in the social sciences whose methods and techniques could most usefully be appropriated for the study of persistent international issues; thirdly, inventories have been drawn up by individual scholars, universities and institutes, of topics and concrete projects which would best serve in the development of general principles in the field, and the validation of them through systematic inquiry. Today, the threefold concern of international politics is with (1) the forces and influences which bear on the conduct of foreign policy everywhere; (2) the technique and machinery by which foreign policy is executed; and (3) the institutions and practices whereby the conflicts among nations are adjusted and accommodated.

The central operative device for the analysis of the conduct of foreign policy is the concept of the national interest. This concept is, in turn, based on the analysis of power and political conflict among the political systems we call national states. In this sense, then, foreign policy in practice is said to be the outgrowth of particular objective conditions which set limits to what any nation can do. There are clusters or aggregates of power and interests that, when viewed by statesmen schooled in a common tradition of national policy, tend to produce foreign policies that have similar patterns. Thus the study of international politics has come to focus on the *political* behavior of states. Consequently, it is possible to ask the same questions about international politics one would ask about politics in general.

It was pointed out, therefore, that students of international politics should inquire into what is common to the behavior of all states instead of merely deciding what is unique in the conduct of states. It was suggested that the political scientist who abstracts from international relations that aspect of behavior which involves the response of a nation in its conduct of foreign policy to a certain objective political situation involving both *external* and *internal* factors is thereby enabled to make comparisons when those factors are repeated. Indeed, it is precisely in comparisons of this kind that the principles of international politics must be sought.

Since a central concept of international politics is that of the national interest, the question was raised as to what tests or criteria are to be used in determining what are the interests (both vital and secondary) which shape the foreign policy of any state. Is the student of international politics to accept, at face value, the definition of national interests given by the statesmen of a particular state? Or does the examination of power factors, geography, historical development, and the like, offer the student of international politics certain rough tests for defining the "objective" interests of the state? Discussion of this led to a suggestion that we assume the concept of national interest as a focal point for investigation. Two approaches seem possible, to be used separately or in combination:

1. Determine analytically what the national interest "ought to be" (i.e., determine what, according to certain objective criteria, such as national power, vital interests, etc., the "objective" national interest appears to be to the investigator), given certain conditions. One could then compare this evaluation of the national interest with the "actual" definition as provided by the actions and pronouncements of the particular nation.

2. Describe, under the following categories, the reasons why nations define their national interest in certain terms and not in others:
   a. Survival prerequisites.
   b. Objective physical conditions—geography, resources, tradition, past historical decisions, values systems, etc.
   c. Institutional channels through which the national interest is defined and set—i.e., policies and interest images. How are they defined in the political process of the state?
   d. Policy interplay between independent political units and their respective interests, including the pattern of reaction within each.
   e. The subjective pluralism of the society by which the *content* of the interest images is set.

f. Why and how the definitions of interest of particular groups differ from or correspond with the criteria of "objective" national interests.

Categories *a–d* are in the nature of factors which set *limits* on the definition of the national interest. Category (*e*) is the factor which defines the possibilities in substantive terms.

On the basis of this scheme, it was suggested, there might be a useful "division of labor" or cooperation between students of international politics and students of comparative politics. Categories (*b*) and (*d*) could best be handled by students of international politics; the other categories could best be handled by specialists in comparative government.

More generally, a cooperative effort between students of international politics and comparative politics should be centered around the following general areas of mutual interest:

1. The process of decision-making has in itself become a function in international politics through the existing various organizations and agencies: How does this decision-making take place? Through what channels? Is it accompanied by any broad legitimacy ideas or myths that transcend the national states?

2. The concept of "national interest" provides us with some meaningful concepts for the study of foreign policy. As was pointed out, the concept will have to be broken down into a number of component parts, some of which would be studied by the student of comparative politics, while others will remain within the domain of international politics. Given, for instance, generally analogous conditions, the definition of national interest by individual states varies. What accounts for this variation? Is it due to the composition of elites? The character of communications within a given state? The type of the political system? These seem to be proper questions for the comparative politics specialist.

3. The study of the focal point at which the states meet—diplomacy and negotiations through which conflicts are resolved or common objectives realized—is a cooperative task which admits of no arbitrary allocation of duties. For the action of each state depends upon domestic conditions and internal images, as well as traditional forces. Relations between states, on the other hand, have repercussions upon domestic myths, images, authority symbols and institutions. Domestic and international politics are in that sense not opposite poles in a continuum of political behavior, but rather complementary factors.

4. The student of international politics may also join hands with the student of comparative politics in attempting to define and study an area. For it is evident that certain uniform outlooks and behavior patterns may be due to similar experiences commonly shared by a number of states vis-à-vis the other states. Here again, the study of uniformities and differences is primarily a joint task.

5. Finally, goals of foreign policy may again be jointly studied. Foreign policy is, in the context of national interest, to be conceived as a dynamic interplay of (a) the given or chosen goals, (b) the organic elements that set limiting conditions upon the selection of goals, and (c) the selection of strategy or means for the achievement of the given or chosen goals.

COMMENTS ON THE SEMINAR REPORT

I

The basic hypothesis of the Report is no doubt the one in which the "legitimacy myth" is described as a "framework" within which the political process takes place (p. 649). This process is in turn characterized as one "through which numerous political aspirations," as represented by groups interested in policy or power, "strive for recognition and elevation to the position of legitimacy." And the factors which determine the outcome are called "the effective power factors of the system."

There can be little doubt that "legitimacy" is an important aspect of power, and that make-beliefs ("myths") associated with making power legitimate are of key interest to political science. It is another question whether they should be stressed to the extent they are in the Report. It is well-known that the problem of legitimacy came to the fore in connection with the French revolution. Rousseau, in the famous opening passages of his *Contrat Social,* stated that he could explain what might make legitimate the chains in which man found himself as a member of organized society. But unlike the members of the Seminar, he did not think of this problem exclusively as one of "mythology." Since his time, historical research has clearly revealed that the problem of legitimacy achieved its predominant place in modern Western thought as a result of the extreme stress laid upon law as a foundation of society. It seems questionable whether a realistic appraisal of other societies will reveal this issue as the central one of all government, even though it may occupy a not insignificant place.

Some of what follows this statement of the central issue of comparative politics seems to suffer from excessive abstraction and formalism. This seems curious in view of the Report's avowed hostility to formal approaches. What seems to have received inadequate attention is the fact that any systematic scheme is bound to be both formal and abstract.

A great part of the history of political thought, both past and present, seems in point of fact to be dominated by the *problems* which an emergent, that is to say constantly evolving, society throws into the face of the student of these matters.[1] Whether it be the decline of the city state or the emergence of the Soviet Union and its totalitarianism, there always seem to be novel problems calling for thought and action. These problems are usually the result not of abstract ratiocination but of the actual evolution of human society. It is this fact, well-known to be sure, which forces social studies to be oriented in concrete terms toward concrete problems in a way alien to the natural sciences.

The present Report gets around to this aspect of the matter when it takes up those problems which it calls "policy-oriented," in contrast to "narrow-range" and "middle-range" problems. However, it seems questionable to insist upon this trichotomy. For policy-oriented problems are typically problems which may be either narrow-range or middle-range or contain some characteristics of both. This may be illustrated by reference to problems encountered in studies of federalism in which the author (with a group of others) recently engaged. These studies (since published as *Études sur le Fédéralisme* by the *Mouvement Européen*) were undertaken at the request of policy-makers in Europe who are confronted with the question of what policies to adopt regarding a potential federal constitution for a European political community. To assist them in this policy problem, they desired a comparative survey of practices in existing federal states; of these, Australia, Canada, and the United States, besides Switzerland and Germany, seemed of especial interest. Since the existing literature was lacking in precision and scope, an assessment was undertaken. But the terms of reference for this assessment were set by the policy-makers who had to deal with definite issues, such as how to organize the executive of such a federation, or to what extent to transfer to it fiscal competencies hitherto exercised by the existing states.

---

[1] The importance of the problem approach is explicitly recognized in one part of the Report, pp. 651–52.

According to the Report, these are "formal" problems of little interest to comparative politics; but it would seem that the policy-makers concerned would have found the Report's approach "formal," because unsuited to the concrete and specific problems confronting them. It may be objected that the making of a constitution is in itself a "formal" task and that therefore research in order to assist it must also be "formal." Yet in view of the realities of politics, the drafting of a constitution appears to be one of the most concrete tasks which political science may be asked to contribute toward.

The Report seems to imply that no theory or theoretical hypotheses have been advanced to date. Is this really tenable? Even the particular theory of politics to which the drafters of the Report are committed is not lacking in exponents. In this connection, the Report's use of the word "empirical" is subject to criticism. For one thing, the meaning is not made clear; moreover, the connection with the position of the Report is not shown. "Empirical" data are presumably data of experience, but it belongs among the most important and difficult tasks of political science to determine whose experiences, and what kind of experiences are to be taken into account.[2] To this task the Report ought to have addressed itself, even if only in summary form. It might then have discovered that a good many of the problems of structure which the Report gainsays as "formal" are the very ones on which significant empirical evidence can be gathered and employed for the development of useful and probably valid hypotheses.

Not only are both the problem approach and the issues involved in area studies explicitly recognized, but at least one highly significant strand of emergent thought has been elaborated, namely, the problem of decision-making.[3] Perhaps it is inevitable that in such a context earlier work is slighted or neglected. Some of the most valid propositions set forth in the Report are in fact those which have been recognized for a long time. It may be well at this point to recur once again to the problem approach and its relation to policy. The Report alleges that much policy-oriented theory "deals with the immediate practical solution of important problems and is consequently focused on problems derived from pressing conflict situations or an overwhelming need for action at the governmental level." This way of putting the matter misstates the crucial issues. Not only do problems suggested by such situations and policy issues very frequently lead to a solution not of practical, but rather of theoretical problems—the practical ones having proved insoluble—but also it is characteristically the task of the student of comparative politics to show how a variety of solutions have been attempted, each working with some degree of success, but none without corresponding difficulties. This type of situation was strikingly illustrated in our studies on federalism. Whether in the institutional or the functional fields, each federation had adopted different solutions to the same problems. These different solutions tended on the whole to fit into the particular system of federalism—though with some significant exceptions. Evolutionary factors and historical antecedents also play their role. But from all this variety there nonetheless arises a common core of typically federal solutions which must be seen in terms not only of static inter-relationships of power and structure, but also in terms of emergent developmental patterns or constructs.

---

[2] The Report employs the word "falsification," presumably an analogy to "verification," to designate a procedure by which a certain hypothesis is disproved or proved false. This is not a very fortunate term; but apart from that, it is important to recognize that in any ultimate sense, none of the significant hypotheses of political science can ever be proven or disproven; we are dealing only with degrees of probability on account of the nature of the evidence at our disposal.

The same point may be made with reference to an issue taken up in the Report, namely that of national interest. "Interest theory" is one of the more familiar hunting grounds of jurisprudence, to which a great deal of ingenuity has been applied by past generations. Of this discussion, too little evidence is contained in the Report. Instead it relates national interest too exclusively to problems of power and the competition for it. Interest is vitally related to what people want (to put it very simply) and the range is therefore most extensive. The list given (p. 656) offers a rather abstract and formless approach to the matter. In view of such studies as Beard's, it lacks precision, if not also scope. If there is such a thing as "objective national interest" (what national interest "ought to be" according to the Report), it surely resembles the proverbial metaphysical black hat.

In conclusion, it might be said that the Report confirms an earlier conclusion of the author:

> . . . Modern political science is largely a critical examination of common-sense notions concerning the working of political institutions and procedures. . . . Most of the materials of this political science are taken from history and law, and the common-sense notions are examined in the light of this historical experience, as if they were scientific hypotheses

---

[3] Lasswell, in his contribution to *The Policy Sciences* (Stanford, 1951), which he edited with Daniel Lerner, has recently claimed "decision-making" to be properly the problem of other social sciences, rather than political science. This appears more than doubtful.

> formulated for the purpose of discovering general rules or "laws" of politics. Since most of the common-sense notions regarding the working of political institutions and procedures are at least partially inaccurate, different and strictly scientific hypotheses should be developed by the political scientist . . . modern political science is not concerned with the forms of government . . . it is concerned with the instruments or techniques of political action in terms of the objectives they are supposed to serve. It is, therefore, to some extent concerned with prediction, even though conditional. . . .[4]

The Report is right in saying that as these more scientific hypotheses develop, they will in turn be subjected to further analysis and testing. And it is to be hoped that the evolving verified generalizations will be correlated in the future, as they have been in the past, not only in descriptive, scientific systems, but also in terms of the values that are a meaningful part of the society to which these generalizations refer. In these efforts and aspirations political science, through comparative politics, ought to cooperate with the other social sciences and disciplines. Such cooperation will be facilitated if political science remains focused upon its primary task, the study and understanding of governmental processes, and does not allow itself to be sidetracked into the more misty realms of a sociology whose claim to scientific value is compounded of hopes and pretenses, rather than solid accomplishments of a scientific and scholarly certainty beyond dispute.

CARL J. FRIEDRICH.

Harvard University.

II

The Seminar is on sound ground in lamenting the degree to which the study of comparative politics has been water-logged with the formalistic details of a parochial choice of cases. It is not entirely clear from the highly condensed Report how successful the participants were in divesting themselves of all the traditional blinders that have held back progress in the field. At the risk of belaboring the obvious I shall underline some implications of the configurative method when it is taken with the seriousness that it richly deserves.

The scope of comparative politics is to demonstrate the *equivalency* of diverse patterns as well as the occurrence of *identical* patterns. There is no basis for assuming that any specific political pattern invariably has the same results, or that its occurrence is invariably conditioned by the same factors. At the same time there is ground for the assumption that a given pattern may occasionally appear with identical consequences and conditions.

The position affirmed here is that any myth (or part myth) may be found in all conceivable relations with any pattern of operation. It is therefore no surprise to find that the doctrines and formulas of human dignity may be interwoven with observances that extend from perfect compatibility to the direct opposite. Similarly, we expect to discover that any party system may come into existence or continue to endure as a function of factors that are either identical in various situations, or on the contrary, afford many points of contrast from case to case. The same range is to be expected when the *consequences* of a party system are made subject to investigation.

---

[4] Carl J. Friedrich, *Constitutional Government and Democracy* (Boston, 1941), pp. 593–94.

If the political scientist makes up his mind in advance that the only results that will satisfy him are the discovery of identical cases, he is destined to waver between the disappointments that arise from the inconclusiveness of most of his results, and the disappointments that come from the obviousness of the instances in which such relatively rare identities are brought to light. If on the contrary the political scientist becomes fully cognizant of the importance of the phenomenon of equivalence, he will have made an important advance in method. The phenomenon teaches him to respect the diversity of the configurations that may produce the results which from his point of view are the "same." The investigator will hunt the new and differentiating factor with the same sense of contribution that he experiences when he comes across examples of the "nickel in the slot" relationship.

The scholar is liberated from the temptation to "over-interpret" his data in the hope of fitting their diverse features into a few procrustean beds of theory. As a policy advisor he may turn his creative imagination to the problem of inventing patterns of action that may "make all the difference" and yet may be much simpler or more daring than are conventionally thought of by political scientists. If in an industrializing country an objective sought by policy is to encourage honesty in administration, and confidence in the integrity of the public service, the advisor may think of such "trivial" ideas as the introduction of cash registers under the supervision of outsiders. This innovation may dispense with efforts to think up gruesome penalties in the criminal code, or to multiply the number of platform declarations in favor of decency and of speeches extolling virtue.

The Report is well justified in advocating field work on the contemporary scene as it unrolls into the future. What is said along this line would be strengthened if it were linked with prediction and experiment. Political scientists do well to test their mastery of the dynamisms of a political and social system by predicting immediate, middle-range, and long-range futures. The technique of prediction is to specify change x and to state the conditions (y' . . .) in which it is anticipated. Such a systematic structure is not to be confused with forecasting in the sense of asserting that party X will win at the polls tomorrow by 50,000. Predictions are families of hypotheses; forecasts are not. (You know no more by studying the forecast in relation to outcome than you knew before.)

Political scientists intervene in the developing situation when they give currency to predictions. This fact opens the way for the systematic planning and control of interventions by the scholar and the scientist. Matched situations may be subject to different methods of treatment, as when no predictions are made in some, predictions are limited to a few leaders in others, and general predictions are made in a third group. The countries now undergoing industrialization afford a fertile field for systematic prediction during the next few years.

The Report lays insufficient emphasis upon the crucial role in comparative studies of the maximization postulate. Comparative studies have usually given a conglomerate rather than a disciplined and integrated impression because of the absence of systematic use of this postulate. By maximization is meant the general expectation concerning human conduct that the alternative of response is chosen that is expected by the chooser to yield more advantages than the recognized alternatives. Describing a political situation in this perspective makes it essential to treat the patterns that are accepted or rejected in the same terms. That is, it is necessary to demonstrate that the data about expectation enable us to predict the result in all cases. If a two-party system is followed by a single-party set-up, or if any other system-succession occurs, it is essential to obtain the following data: (1) Who was for or against which pattern? (2) On the basis of what values did the individuals or groups concerned make their estimates? (3) On the basis of what information did they arrive at their estimates?

The data required about politics by the maximization postulate is more refined than can be obtained in many research studies, especially of historical situations, and of many top elites in the contemporary scene. But it is far from out of the question in all cases, since the volume of private minutes, diaries, and related sources (to say nothing of interviews) provide all the materials needed.

Whenever a new depth of intensiveness is added to the requirements of research, the magnitude of the undertaking suddenly zooms to new and formidable heights. If political scientists think only in terms of demonstrating identical cases, they are doomed to the frustrations that come from finding only a few cases of the most important systems they want to study. The contextural approach on the other hand, by raising the evaluation of the discovery of equivalences, gives a new zest to inquiry. It does so by directing attention to the finer structure of the support groups active in political situations, and to the values, expectations and sources of information on the basis of which evaluations are made. Very often the significant result will be to show how a given political pattern is kept the "same" throughout a given period by varying constellations of support elements; how the values that enter into the calculation of these elements manage to compensate for shifts in the role of any value; and how the expectations that remain steady depend upon compensating sources of information.

Only studies of this degree of refinement are contributory in dealing with the technical and detailed questions that are the appropriate concern of political scientists who concentrate upon the exploration of comparative politics. It is to be hoped that the Report will prove to have provided an incentive to the consideration of political systems with the full equipment of the modern configurative approach.[1]

HAROLD D. LASSWELL.

Yale University.

---

[1] The attention of political scientists may be called to a methodological statement in an overlapping field: Myres S. McDougal, "The Comparative Study of Law for Policy Purposes: Value Clarification as an Instrument of Democratic World Order," *Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 61, pp. 915–46 (June–July, 1952), published concurrently in the first number of the *American Journal of Comparative Law.*

III

The Seminar has outlined in admirable fashion the issues that have to be faced in pursuing research in this important field. Rather than survey again the ground they have covered so well, I should like to develop further three of the points the Seminar has raised.

Intercultural Comparisons. Trouble begins for the researcher with the word "comparative." What are we comparing, and why? To pursue the question, let us indulge in a bit of comparative speculation and consider what "comparative" means in the sciences of comparative anatomy and physiology.

To take a crude example, the anatomist might be interested in the comparative weights of the brain in two vertebrate species. In order to make the comparison, he must first identify in each of the two species a structure that is sufficiently similar that he is willing to give it the same name ("the brain"). Then, having identified this common structure, he must describe in what ways it is the same, in what ways different, in the two species. For example, the ratio of brain weight to body weight turns out to be a significant statistic for the comparison of species.

Notice that *two* elements are essential to the comparison: (1) a fundamental similarity (technically, an "isomorphism") between the two objects to be compared; and (2) a description of resemblances and differences between the similar elements in the two objects compared. Without the first element, the second is meaningless. There is a famous story about a debate between two eminent comparative anatomists as to the relative size of the spleen in the rabbit and the whale. Their heated conversation was overheard by a classical scholar who turned to them and said: "But Gentlemen! Aristotle says that the whale *has* no spleen." He turned out to be right, and this ended the discussion of the comparative anatomy of spleens.

The similarity, or isomorphism, that provides the basis for comparison need not be *structural.* If we wish to compare a bird with a mammal, the wings of the former are isomorphic (in certain important respects) with the forelegs of the latter. But what if we wish to compare the bird with an insect equipped with six legs and four wings? In this case we might still be interested in a comparison of *functionally* similar elements—wings with wings. In other cases we are interested in *phylogenetic* similarity—for example, between the feathers of a bird and the fur of a bear. Many of the propositions of the comparative biologist are concerned with the relation among these three kinds of similarity: structural, functional, and phylogenetic. How have two structures that are phylogenetically similar changed in the course of evolution? Is a similar function in two species performed by similar or dissimilar structures?

I have drawn out the analogy at some length, because I believe it carries many lessons for the researcher in comparative politics. Let us consider a commonplace proposition like: "France has a multi-party system, the United States a two-party system." The similar element being compared in the two systems is the "party." But is the French party structurally similar to the

American, functionally, phylogenetically—or similar in some other respect? Perhaps a more significant correspondent to the French party is the American "faction"—of which there are at least four—and to the American party, the French *groupement*. Until we decide which structural element in the American system is to be compared with which element in the French, the original statement is meaningless. My own suspicion is that what we are really interested in here is not so much a counting of parties as a comparative analysis of the function of forming legislative majorities in the two governments, including the steps leading up to the selection of legislators. Then the similar element that provides the basis for the comparison is not the "party" structure, but the function of "forming majorities."

One final example will further illuminate the problem. I have seen hardly anything written in comparison of Japanese and American government that did not stress the wider acceptance of authority by subordinates in the former than in the latter government. One of my graduate students, Takehiko Matsuda, and I have tried to formulate a procedure for testing operationally this generally accepted proposition. The obvious way to do it is to specify some similar situations in the two cultures, and then to see in which situation there is a greater acceptance of authority. Only when he undertakes to do it explicitly does the researcher become aware of the formidable difficulties in defining the "similar situations." I do not mean to imply that it is impossible to test the proposition in question, but merely to point to some of the difficulties that have to be met in designing the test.

Causality and Correlation. A second problem with which the Seminar wrestled concerned the ways in which the researcher could distinguish, when he had noticed an association between two or more factors in several cultures, between genuine causal connections and fortuitous associations. Before this distinction can be made, the term "cause" has to be restored to scientific respectability. The impact of Hume, together with the kinds of mathematical methods that are used by the natural sciences, have led to wide acceptance of the slogan: "There is no causation, only functional interdependence."

Of course, deep down in our hearts we have never believed this (and a few brave souls, e.g., MacIver, have said so). Even though we accept the critique of Hume, we find it hard to think that there is no difference between a "spurious" and a "genuine" correlation. Fortunately, recent advances in statistical theory have clarified the issue and have indicated a way—consistent with Hume—of defining causal relations. The story is a lengthy one, which I will not try to tell here. The interested reader can refer to the sources mentioned in the footnote.[1]

These developments deserve particular attention from political scientists because they cast a great deal of light on the kinds of asymmetrical relations with which he is accustomed to deal—e.g., power and authority relations. The causal relation is also asymmetric, and the clarification of that relation turns out to be fundamental to the definition of power and authority.

---

[1] See Herbert A. Simon, "On the Definition of the Causal Relation," *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 49, pp. 517–28 (July 31, 1952); and Chapter 3 of *Studies in Econometric Methods*, ed. W. Hood and T. Koopmans (New York, 1953).

National Interest. Unless we define national interest in terms of "ultimate" goals—the good, the true, and the beautiful, so to speak—goals and strategies become very much intermingled. This kind of situation seems to me best clarified by the decision-making framework of analysis. What we are concerned with are the premises that enter into political decisions of national states. What are the values that are weighed in reaching such decisions? What factual premises are taken into account? The important factual premises include both the kinds listed under *2b* and *d* in the Report (p. 656). In particular, those under *d* are vitally important. I don't think one could define the current American "national interest" without reference to American expectations and estimates of the Soviet national interest and the Soviet strategy—and vice versa.

We are confronted with all the complexities and perplexities of game theory in which the behavior of each party depends critically upon his expectations of the behavior and strategies of the others. If we are to avoid the vacuity of defining national interest in such terms as "prosperity and freedom," then what we are really concerned with is the "national strategy." This is much more than a statement of national goals; it is actually a statement of conditions that the national policy must satisfy in order to achieve the national goals.

HERBERT A. SIMON.

Carnegie Institute of Technology.

IV

The condition which the Report seeks to correct is one in which the sterile description of gadgets has long eclipsed a more complex kind of analysis which regards government in the context of its society. The chief merit of the study is that it may help restore the study of foreign governments to its proper relationship with the cultures from which they have been rudely extracted. It seems clear from perusal of texts and research that we have been busy describing other peoples' gadgets and have paid little attention to beliefs and ideals which lie under the externals. To compare externals without profound understanding of their cultural context is to invite the accumulation of half-baked hypotheses which will place the study of governments in an even more unsatisfactory state.

The Seminar apparently devoted much time to this problem both in its discussion of the methodological difficulties of comparison, and in its specific mention of treating government in relation to what it called "the total configuration." In this respect it reaffirmed the similar concern of a different committee which stated in 1944:

> The methodological—or should one say the transcendental—interest of the group was focused on the position and function of comparative government in relation to the general culture-pattern of the state. From the stale routine of dissecting and describing foreign political institutions there emerged a blueprint of a branch of human knowledge which, "catholic" in the literal sense of the word, should become the coordinator and integrator of much that heretofore has been kept apart by narrow compartmentalization into iso-

> lated and unrelated disciplines. . . . Research should be conducted in such a way as to make it a tool for the understanding of our political civilization as a whole rather than as an accumulation of unrelated information on individual political systems.[1]

Yet for all its concern over the relation of government to its milieu, the Seminar deals with this approach merely as one of several alternatives rather than as an indispensable prerequisite to further comparative studies. It is, of course, no new idea to view government against the background of its society.[2] Nonetheless, we seem to have lost sight of this requirement. American political science is oriented strongly toward Europe, with which we share a common philosophical heritage. Hence we take for granted that the American analyst of European governments understands the foundations of the governments he sets out to study. For the most part this assumption is true, or at least was true before the fragmentation of knowledge which now characterizes most American scholarship. Yet when we come to the study of non-European governments, those of Asia, for instance, this assumption must be reconsidered. In studying Oriental politics we deal not only with totally strange societies but also with ideas and values often incompatible with those of the West. To study the governments of Asia without prior intimacy with the ideas of Asia is to catalog but not to understand. The study of Oriental governments is crucial because it must deal with the issue of comparability in its sharpest terms. This problem requires, I suspect, somewhat more attention than the Seminar gave it, and to it my subsequent comments will be directed.

Other factors have helped divorce the study of government from the study of culture. The first relates to the internal development of our discipline; the second to the external relations of political science with higher learning. The division of our discipline into allegedly unrelated segments (particularly public administration and international relations) has separated us from the life-giving base of theory. We can hardly call American political science the same study of politics which Aristotle described as the master science. This separation has been transferred to our study of foreign governments and we are displeased with the results, as the Seminar makes obvious. There is evidence to indicate that our discipline is becoming more intellectually integrated—that we are returning to the broader Aristotelian concept of politics.[3] As we recast the pieces of politics into a mosaic, we will approach comparative government from quite a different point of view. Another factor is that political science as a study has become divorced from the intellectual (particularly literary, theological, and philosophical) currents of our time. This isolation is understandably reflected in our methods of studying other governments. In this respect there is a relationship between our approach to comparative politics and the development of American higher education. As there is integration and breadth in higher learning, so will there be a greater inclination to look at "the total configuration" when we study other forms of government.

---

[1] Karl Loewenstein, "Report of the Research Panel on Comparative Government," this REVIEW, Vol. 38, pp. 542–43 (June, 1944).

[2] Bacon, Bryce, Montesquieu (to cite but a few sages of our cult) discussed the matter brilliantly. Even some of our contemporaries, borrowing from our white-coated colleagues, have talked of the "ecology" of government. And, of course, F. S. C. Northrop has developed the concept extensively in his *The Taming of the Nations* (New York, 1952).

[3] One piece of evidence is the fact that two recent presidential addresses at the annual meetings of our Association dealt with this problem. See James K. Pollock, "The Primacy of Politics," this REVIEW, Vol. 45, pp. 1–18 (March, 1951) and Peter Odegard, "Variations on a Familiar Theme," this REVIEW, Vol. 45, pp. 961–74 (Dec., 1951).

There is no doubt that the recent work of cultural anthropologists, the development of area studies since the Second World War, and extended contact with Asia are factors which have directed our attention to the need for knowledge of the total culture in studying foreign governments. Yet we seem to handle this idea with timidity rather than confidence, as I think is indicated when the Seminar makes it optional along with "conceptual approach" and "problem approach." Granted there are problems in defining what we mean by "area." These are summarized in the Report (pp. 653–54). But these problems are not impossible to surmount, at least for purposes of developing a systematic method of examining other governments. Common historical experience, common acceptance of religious and philosophical values, and a noticeable degree of stable and mature homogeneity: these would make a reasonable basis for delineating a cultural area for further study. Certainly the Far East is not such an area. Asia would have to be divided into three or four regions. As each region is studied in historical perspective, the sphere of validity will change. It is possible, for example, to regard China, Japan, Korea and the Ryukyus as one fairly homogenous culture during one period of Far Eastern history. Yet though these nations share a common Taoist-Confucianist base, there were historical factors sufficiently powerful to change the quality of each national culture: in the case of Japan, 300 years of Tokugawa domination; in the case of China, rule by Mongol and Manchu; and in the case of Korea and the Ryukyus, the influence of China and Japan. Pursuing this kind of cultural analysis, the student of Asian governments is likely to find himself comparing various facets within the changing cultural orbits. It is conceivable that under the circumstances he may never reach the point at which he can project his comparison to a Western culture. While this may delay the development of a sophisticated and mature methodology designed to discover universals, it is delay which is essential for validity.

The Seminar poses the problem (p. 642) of distinguishing between causal and fortuitous relationships of factors taken out of different governments for purposes of comparison. I do not see how the distinction can be made without analysis of all the causal factors within the cultures being considered. If we were to compare the literacy figures of Japan and the United States (to develop an example used in the Report) with the votes cast in Japanese and American national elections—what significance would mere columns of figures have? The relationship of the factors may well be fortuitous; the only way we can tell if it is causal is to examine the total cultural context of literacy and voting in both societies. This would involve, at the minimum, an analysis of attitudes toward government, toward authority, knowledge of the nature of measuring literacy, extent of non-literate sources of public information, party activity, kinship structure. The analysis would spiral outward and downward until it encompassed the total range of observable culture. The result would be a pattern of relations between certain causes in both societies. Only after this pattern is determined can real comparability result.

There is another reason why any study of Asia which ignores the total fabric of society is likely to be unproductive. This is simply the uniqueness of many of the externals of Asian government. The problem does not arise in quite the same way when governments of the West are compared. France has its *Conseil d'État,* it is true, but both England and the United States have highly developed bodies of administrative law even though they lack an independent juridical structure for its administration. Often the distinctions of the West are distinctions of degree rather than kind. But where in the West (aside from the *mir* of Russia, which itself probably has Asiatic antecedents) can we find anything remotely similar to the system of collective neighborhood responsibility found in the *chia-pao* of China, or the *tonari-gumi* of Japan? There is nothing in our own system to which these institutions can be compared. But careful analysis of the factors giving rise to these institutions may lead to significant hypotheses. Certainly the idea of the Chinese censorate (found in the Chinese constitution and reflected in Japanese government) cannot be productively compared to anything in the West (notwithstanding the fact that both Vermont and Pennsylvania had councils of censors for a brief period). Risking facile generalization, analysis of the culture would probably reveal that censors were necessary because of the broad discretion allowed Chinese and Japanese administrators. This trust of the administrator in turn is probably due to Confucian optimism about the essential goodness of man and the particular virtue of the educated official. This kind of analysis requires intimacy with the writings of Confucius, Lao-tze, Mencius and others. Thus the spiral spreads to include the ideas held sacred by the people.

A Chinese poet once expressed the Taoist concept of oneness by saying that only when the artist was inside a bamboo stalk could he really paint the whole grove. This is a formula for total cultural immersion which I believe to be requisite to any analysis of Asian governments.

RALPH J. D. BRAIBANTI.

Duke University.

V

The Report is a valuable collection of techniques for the advancement of comparative government. My disagreements with it are mostly matters of emphasis. They are, however, generalized in a belief that levels and stages of desirable development and alternative techniques for handling different sorts of material need to be much more clearly differentiated.

As to emphasis, I think the Report gives far too much weight to further systematic classification as a *preliminary stage* preceding the extensive formulation of hypotheses. While I grant that a good deal of useful ordering of data can still be accomplished, I see no way of attaining *agreement* on any particular classificatory scheme as preferable to others in advance of the partial verification of hypotheses which successfully make use of its categories. Once a certain sophistication has been attained in the handling of a body of materials, meticulous attention to pure classification is an intellectually sterile pursuit. Political science, I think, has already fairly adequately pursued its "natural history" stage of development. I therefore deprecate any serious growth of cooperative projects which aim primarily at forming classifications, or checklists, or mere definitions of problems. The originality and boldness required in developing the new concepts out of which, as will be shown, hypotheses need to be constructed could be seriously impeded by the etiquette imposed by team-work if the latter were applied, as has been suggested, to the process of vocabulary construction. In other words, I see as the primary need for rapid advance a familiarity not now present with the technique of advancing useful hypotheses. Much more valuable checklists and classification tables can be made later on than now. They can then use the concepts that will have proved useful in successful hypotheses and their formulators will not, as they now would, feel impelled to include the bulk of our present stock of loosely applicable philosophic abstractions and aesthetic configurations.

As to levels or stages of development, many of the questions raised in the Report and in current discussions of methodology are unanswerable when submitted as universal alternatives ignoring time and circumstance. The answers, however, are often fairly obvious with respect to some given stage of research development. I have in mind something undoubtedly similar to what the Report intends by the problem of "degrees of abstraction" to which it repeatedly refers. I think, however, that there is little clarity in this formulation. To me the attainment of true science involves the successful passing over from the use of broad aesthetic concepts of large configurations to very narrowly defined variables rigidly abstracted from the aesthetic contexts in which they appear. I doubt that there is much intervening variation between these two kinds of concepts, certainly nothing accurately scalable. The only "degree of abstraction" which I regard as relevant in this context refers to the extent to which concepts of the second type (narrowly defined variables) are in use in a given subject-matter.

Now the way to handle broad aesthetic concepts to aid intuitive understanding is one thing and the way to handle isolated variables as tools of scientific explanation is another. We now possess mainly concepts of the former (broad aesthetic) type and unless we are to sit back and make no judgments until someday we may attain "full scientific stature" as a discipline, we must continue to use these concepts prudently. What must be realized is that no reasoning, however prudent and responsible, involving the type of concepts now generally in use in our field, will ever yield objectively verifiable generalizations of the type associated with the successfully developed sciences. Rather we may anticipate, with good fortune, the gradual building up of scientific knowledge of particular aspects of politics by the use of concepts of a type now unfamiliar to us and in their nature foreign to our present habits of broad aesthetic description. For a long time, and I would presume forever, political scientists must be prepared to think alternatively (1) as responsible artists and philosophers in handling the many vital problems which existing scientific knowledge does not conclusively settle, and (2) as scientists with respect to those matters for which identifiable and measurable variables have been successfully isolated. In the first role they must maintain the cultivated tolerance of humanism which does not expect that by argument all scholars will ever be convinced of the validity of some single point of view. In the second role they may expect to see develop a gradual unanimity of competent scholars on many points which will have been successfully analyzed in terms of measurable variables.

To me the road to science is a development from aesthetically defined and intuitively reasoned concepts of broad and somewhat loose reference to highly abstract isolated variables linked by rigidly stated hypotheses that have been at least partially verified. This cannot, however, be a uniform development of the whole field of political science as at present known, and passage from one stage to the next can therefore refer only to some particular matter of investigation. Broad aesthetic definition and intuitive reasoning cannot at any foreseeable point be abandoned by the practitioners of our subject-matter, for pressing problems will still require this method of argument. It will, however, be superseded in each particular matter for which a true scientific explanation is attained.

As a preliminary step toward genuine scientific comparison, practitioners must be prepared on occasion to reject rich contextual wholes and to concentrate attention upon aesthetically minor elements that recur in many different situations. These elements must be such as can in some sense be measured, at least to the extent of an unambiguous determination that an item is present or absent in a situation. Thus a student of cabinet-systems (a broad aesthetic concept) might profitably turn his entire research attention for a time to some such matters as the ages, the educational levels attained, or the prior occupational experience of cabinet members, on the basis of some hunch that variations in these data may be correlated with some more obviously significant variables. The difficulty of this first step and the reason for much of the flirtatious behavior of political scientists when confronted with the question of becoming scientists, is that at the present time it can be recommended for no other purpose than the possible building of a future scientific system. From any other standpoint, since such a scientific system does not now exist, the person who expects to have to make responsible explanations and evaluations will be poorly advised to neglect any part of the general context in which his material lies.

The passing over to science in any phase or aspect of politics will be marked by the coming into use of certain concepts in the nature of operationally defined variables, for the presence or for the values of which in situations for which data have been assembled there will no longer be protracted and wordy disputes among practitioners. We will all know, for instance, that Ruritania shows a current rating of +5 and Liliputia −1 on the alpha-ocracy scale and of 2 and 6 respectively on the beta-ology scale and that consequently (under accepted hypotheses) their gamma-ometry rating must necessarily be +1 and −7 respectively. This will be considered relevant information that would necessarily have to be taken into account in forming policy with respect to these countries, though in all probability it will hardly be sufficient to settle conclusively just what the best policies should be. We shall still presumably be disputing to some extent just what we or Ruritania or Liliputia should do about conditions in Ruritania or Liliputia, but we shall not be plagued by "schools of thought" as to just what the alpha, beta, or gamma ratings of those countries actually are.

Accompanying the introduction of operationally defined concepts will be the increasing use of *rigid statements* of the relations thought to prevail among them. These will be hypotheses and some of them will become more and more firmly established as their repeated usage fails to encounter refutation in experience. In fact there can be little interest in the isolation of measurable variables except insofar as hypotheses are advanced in which they are to be used. Since the interest in explanation obviously lies at this point rather than in a mere enumeration and classification of data it is highly unlikely that much progress toward science will be made until the technique of advancing hypotheses becomes moderately familiar. Here also the breaking of habits will be demanded, because hypotheses likely to be successful in stimulating the accumulation of knowledge will bear little resemblance to the prudent and responsible generalizations we are accustomed to make about our present data. The useful hypothesis must be a rigid and little qualified assertion. Otherwise it (like most prudent writing) could hardly be conclusively refuted by any conceivable evidence; however, the only initial purpose of an hypothesis is to invite the accumulation of evidence to see if it can be disproved. Moreover, it will be impossible for useful hypotheses to refer to the sort of concepts which we most like to talk about and which we normally make propositions about in policy discussions. This is because practically all our stock of political concepts (constitutions, executives, cabinet systems, etc.) refer to such broadly aesthetic configurations that in many cases they are practically unique historically and not strictly comparable with anything else, and at most allow the comparison of a handful of similar cases. Aside from the limitation imposed on scientific treatment by the smallness of the number of cases, these aesthetic configurations could not be provided with unambiguous operational definitions without completely changing their meanings by greatly narrowing their reference to phenomena. Thus it is inconceivable that "democracy" or "liberalism" as ordinarily conceived, with all their richness of historical association, could ever appear in a scientific (i.e., objectively refutable) hypothesis, but quite possibly some operational rating for some aspect of their reference, like decisiveness of popular elections or degree of individual independence in decision-making, might be constructed.

What is the intellectual responsibility of one who advances a significant hypothesis or system of related hypotheses? The implications of this question are largely unfamiliar in a field which has been largely literary and philosophical. Now the formulator of a new theory or the revisor of an old one gets out a book as soon as he has accumulated an impressive body of data, and the book purports to prove the truth of his assertions on the basis of the particular collection of data which he or his project have collected. Actually, such "proof" is relatively ineffective since adherents of other "schools of thought" are practically never convinced but continue to rely upon other treatises which to them "prove" a different viewpoint. In the case of hypotheses which are based on operationally defined variables and which can contribute to the furtherance of scientific investigation, publication is desirable long before there is any complete or definitive accumulation of the evidence needed for their ultimate validation. It is quite unlikely that the formulator will be in a position to conduct any serious proportion of the investigations that will be necessary before the new hypotheses can be considered to be tentatively confirmed. It is therefore desirable that other interested scholars be invited at an early stage to make contributions to the validation process.

The foregoing seem to me to be the basic conceptual requirements for a serious start toward a science of politics or a genuine comparative government. Certain other comments as to where these starts are likely to lead seem highly probable: (1) Because so many political configurations are uniquely defined by locally prevailing belief-systems, it is probable that the genuine variables (historically repetitive elements) derived from the strictly political context of society will be relatively few and that successful explanatory political theory will involve the relation of these few political elements with other variables now regarded as in the provinces of other disciplines; (2) because of the requirements of intelligibility in group work and because any really new theoretical formulation appears more or less absurd before it has to some extent been used in research, a division of labor (as in physics) is likely to come about in which individual scholars in the main contribute the new hypothetical formulations while the work of testing such formulae and modifying them in terms of actual data falls to organized teams; and (3) the development of a science of politics will in no sense provide a complete substitute for the art and philosophy of politics, though much of the content of these activities may be expected to be modified in the light of an accumulation of verified scientific knowledge.

G. LOWELL FIELD.

University of Connecticut.

VI

This is patently a stimulating document, evidencing creative vitality and promising important new developments. I shall therefore not note the many aspects that seem to me meritorious, but direct attention instead to some points which might warrant adverse comment.

1. The word "state" and the expression "comparative government" appear but once each in the Report (if I have observed correctly). Presumably the

single and only incidental—perhaps accidental—use of these expressions is significant. An almost certain surmise, based on the tone and tenor of the Report, is that "state" is not regarded as a meaningful, certainly not as an "operational" concept; and we may guess that "comparative politics" was used instead of "comparative government" because the latter seemed too restricted, too static and institutional in its connotations. This is a legitimate, probably commendable, choice of terminology. But it is not beyond argument and certainly not beyond explanation. Even if one wishes to discard "state" entirely, a reference to its use is helpful in accounting for the parochial emphasis on Western institutions which is deplored. No doubt the conceptualization which has been promoted by the term "state" has sensitized students to look for Western institutions, and to feel lost where they do not exist, or to make false generalizations based upon superficial similarities.

2. In spite of the high level of methodological sophistication of the conferees, the Report conveys the impression in a number of ways ("dismemberment" technique, "checklist," etc.) that data collection is a step logically precedent to hypothesizing. To the extent it does so it falsifies or at least distorts the relationship between data collection and hypothesis. One does not know what to "dismember" or what to "check" unless by some sort of hypothesis the chosen phenomena are significant. While to be sure by a chicken-or-the-egg chain some sort of data lies back of the hypothesis, the Report should not (on other evidence, such as the "problem" approach) be construed to advocate a great program of fact-gathering which must be completed before we can hypothesize.

By the way, I think the conferees underestimate the extent to which the deplored "descriptive" treatments of Western institutions have been, in their time and at their level of conceptualization, "problem" treatments in which hypothesizing played a role. Paradoxically, the present realization of their inadequacy is in part a reflection of their success.

3. "National character" and "ethos" are rejected as tools because they are not "operational." Not mentioned in the Report but also certainly relevant is the fact that they have lent themselves to abuse in "racist" theory. Nevertheless, I suggest that the curt dismissal of these terms is a little arbitrary and somewhat unfair.

In the first place, few if any of the other concepts which receive the approval of the conferees are operational without a great deal of reduction and refinement. Even the four "operational concepts" into which "legitimacy myth" is resolved need a great deal of further sharpening before they are really ready to "operate." On the other hand, no attempt is made to see what "ethos" (which is certainly little more ethereal than "legitimacy myth") could be made to mean in operational terms. I regard the New Mexico study cited as meaningless in this context—whatever else it may illumine. Certainly it should be obvious without demonstration that the interpretation of "constitutional forms of government" would widely vary among the widely varied cultural groups of New Mexico. It is equally obvious that there are important congruencies in interpretation of these concepts among millions of citizens of the United States. If there were not such congruencies in societies, the conferees' proposals to study legitimacy myths and political "trait complexes" would be meaningless. Incidentally, what is meant by the conferees when they speak of "the West," if not an "ethos"? Assuredly not a geographical location.

In the second place, the more careful studies of such things as "legitimacy myths" and "political trait complexes" will not be done for some time. In the meantime we must make do with what materials are available in the learning and teaching process, and for the present it seems to me highly desirable to supplement the more formal and descriptive materials with existing impressionistic treatments of "national character." These must, of course, be selected with care, "balanced" with regard to the national perspectives of their authors, and assigned with strong caveats. The image which emerges still may be blurred and distorted, but it is better than no image.

4. The conferees do not merely suggest, they urge, that "politics" cannot be understood apart from the total configuration—including economic system, social structure, and culture. I concur. And because I concur I wish the conferees had addressed themselves directly to the meaning and implications of this proposition. How do the various "social sciences" fit together in a pattern that gives meaning to each and unity and coherence to the whole? Should we all become students of sociology (or whatever the most general term is) first, and students of politics second? What, for example, of the place assigned politics in the schemata of Talcott Parsons in *The Social System?* We need to address ourselves to such questions without academic parochialism or imperialism. If true comparability exists only if the same "function" is performed, how can we be sure we are comparing "likes" until we have a conceptual apparatus that fits all societies, and then data under the concepts for each society compared?

DWIGHT WALDO.

University of California, Berkeley.

THE ITALIAN ELECTIONS AND THE PROBLEM OF REPRESENTATION*

JOSEPH G. LA PALOMBARA
Michigan State College

Contemporary political science assumes that the representative system, in addition to its influence on the formal structure of government, is functionally related to the internal cohesiveness and equilibrium of society itself. This fact takes on the greatest significance in the modern democratic state, in which the size of the population requires that the representation be indirect. For the political scientist, therefore, a challenging situation arises out of the following question: how can the modern democratic state insure the most adequate and accurate political expression of the elements and currents within it, while still maintaining a government which can function and a safe margin of stability for the society?

That there are no simple formulae for resolving this problem is attested by the many theories of representation which have been propounded and tried during the last century. That a formula is almost desperately needed is demonstrated by postwar European experience.[1] Italy is one of several countries in which the question of representation not only is significant but threatens to divide important segments of the society. The recent Italian elections point up this danger. But the elections, and the parliamentary experience which preceded them, also offer the political scientist a rich store of analytical raw material concerning the process of government and the group behavior which characterizes it.

I

With the unification of Italy, the Charles-Albert Constitution of 1848 was extended to all of the regions which had been incorporated into the new state. The Constitution provided for a uninominal-majoritarian electoral system under which the suffrage was extended to a very restricted segment of the population.[2]

---

* The research on which this article is based was made possible by a Fulbright grant and by financial assistance from the Social Science Research Council and the University of Pennsylvania (Penfield Scholarship Fund).

[1] See James K. Pollock, "The Electoral System of the Federal Republic of Germany—A Study in Representative Government," this REVIEW, Vol. 46, pp. 1056–68 (Dec., 1952).

[2] Until 1870 the vote was granted to males of 25 years or more who could read and write and who had paid at least 40 lire annually in direct taxes. See the selection on Italy by Salvo Mastellone in M. Duverger, *L'influence des systèmes électoraux sur la vie politique* (Paris, 1950), p. 153.

For general background in the history of Italy's electoral and representative system, consult the following: G. Ambrosini, *Sistemi elettorali* (Florence, 1946); C. Montalcini and A. Alberti, *Legge elettorale politica* (Bologna, 1919); Vittore Bonfigli, *La legge elettorale italiana* (Florence, 1946); *Atti Parlamentari, Camera dei Deputati, Documenti—Desegni di legge e relazione*, 1953, No. 2971-A, pp. 35–100. The last item provides an excellent brief survey of the evolution of Italian electoral legislation.

This tight, oligarchical system prevailed throughout the latter period of the Risorgimento and was to provide the Historical Left with an excellent weapon against the Liberal heirs of Cavour. Indeed, as late as 1880 Italy enjoyed the unenviable distinction of holding last place among the countries of Western Europe regarding the ratio of electors to the total population.[3]

Upon the rise to power of the Historical Left in 1876, the country moved in the direction of electoral reform. Following a period of procrastination, two laws were enacted in 1882 which reduced the literacy and property requirements[4] and established a system of limited voting in plurinominal districts. This system, which guaranteed a minimum representation to the strongest minority party, remained in force for only a decade. In 1892, confronted by a fast-growing Socialist movement, the conservative elements of the Historical Right and Left reconsidered their progressivism and shifted back to the old system. Thus, except for a brief interval, the uninominal-majoritarian system prevailed in Italy from 1848 to 1919, when the ascendency of the mass parties brought about Italy's first experience with P.R.

With the growth of Socialism and the gradual formation of genuine political parties in Italy, major changes in the mechanism of elections were to be expected. The minimum demands centered on an extension of the suffrage. But it was also natural, in a country which had been exposed to Thomas Hare's *The Machinery of Government* shortly after its publication in 1859, that the proposals should eventually come to include P.R.[5] Thus, as the matter of unification was replaced by other more important issues, and as *trasformismo*, which characterized Italy's parliamentary system under a DePretis or Giolitti, began to give way to clear-cut party clusters, the matter of P.R. took its place as one of the most widely and avidly debated subjects of the day.[6]

---

[3] In 1871 only 535,000 (1.98%) of 27,000,000 inhabitants enjoyed the suffrage. The property requirement, plus an illiteracy rate which hovered about 75%, effectively restricted the vote to an infinitesimal elite. See Duverger, pp. 153–55. By 1880, 2.4% of the population participated in elections; the figure rose to 7.4% in 1882, 24.4% in 1913, 30.9% in 1919, and 60% in 1946, with the extension of direct universal suffrage to male and female alike. See Istituto Centrale di Statistica, *Le elezioni politiche del 1948: elezione della Camera dei Deputati* (Rome, 1951), Vol. 1, p. 29.

[4] The Law of January 22, 1882 admitted any male citizen over 21 to the suffrage if he could meet either of the following qualifications: (1) present evidence of having completed the elementary grades, or (2) present evidence of having paid at least 19.80 lire annually in direct taxes. The law establishing limited voting also made the provinces the basis of all electoral districts, a system which has remained intact to the present time. See Duverger, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

[5] Hare's system was discussed in the Universities of Parma and Padova as early as 1862. By 1872, an Association for the Study of P.R. had been created at Milan, and it was to make an important contribution—technically and propagandistically—to the successful campaign to institute P.R. in the country. See Bonfigli, *La legge elettorale italiana* (cited in n. 2), pp. 5–11.

[6] Italy has a rich literature on P.R., and the following must therefore be considered a limited selection of a few of the more significant treatises: G. Ambrosini, *La Proporzionale* (Rome, 1946); A. Oxila, *Il problema elettorale* (Florence, 1946); R. Lucifero, *Introduzione alla libertà* (Rome, 1945); F. Squarzina, *La rappresentanza proporzionale* (Rome,

The First World War brought a temporary suspension of the drive for fundamental electoral reform, but this served merely to make the postwar effort that much more pronounced. A liberal extension of the suffrage in 1918 strengthened the base of the mass parties, and the pressure in Parliament began to tell on the opponents of change. Socialists and Catholics alike were agreed on the need for and the superiority of P.R. as an electoral system. Socialists like Filippo Turati and Claudio Treves and Liberals such as Vittorio E. Orlando and Francesco Nitti brought to the debates in Parliament all of the classic arguments in favor of P.R. In the aftermath of war, with labor on the rampage and the mass parties feeling a new-found strength, the defenders of the traditional majoritarian system gave way before the P.R. onslaught.[7] On August 15, 1919, Parliament, after a long and often bitter debate, passed the Nitti Law which established a system of P.R. patterned after the method of d'Hondt. In addition, the voter was given the opportunity to mitigate the influence of the parties by expressing a limited number of preferences on the ballot.[8]

Only two elections—those of November, 1919, and May, 1921—were held under this law. The first returned a greatly strengthened Socialist party and an impressive number of deputies of the Catholic Popular party. The latter election took place in the midst of the disorder and chaos which followed the aborted occupation of the factories in 1920, and it was to be the last free election in Italy until the present postwar era. Although Giolitti's attempt to destroy the Left at the polls had failed, the unwillingness of the Socialists to assume responsibility, coupled with the hysteria of the middle class over the rise of popular power, permitted the Fascists to step in and to take the first major step in the destruction of democracy with the passage of the Acerbo Law of 1923.

The echo of the Blackshirts marching into Rome had not subsided before Mussolini revealed his intention to do away with P.R. Interestingly, the Fascists advanced essentially the same major premises in justification of their law that the Christian Democrats used in favor of the changes which they sought to enact in 1953. Both laws were introduced following a brief experience

---

1945); R. Drago, *La proporzionale nel rispetto della volontà popolare* (Rome, 1946); G. Bandini, *La riforma elettorale con la rappresentanza proporzionale nelle elezioni politiche* (Rome, 1910); G. Bonelli, *Studio sulla rappresentanza proporzionale delle minoranze* (Florence, 1880); S. Sonnino, *Sulla rappresentanza proporzionale in Italia* (Florence, 1872); F. Genala, *Della libertà ed equivalenza dei suffragi—ovvero della proporzionale rappresentanza delle minoranze* (Milan, 1871).

[7] It is interesting that the anti-P.R. elements in 1919 attacked the system on the grounds that it would create a permanent and inflexible majority consisting of the Socialist and Popular parties, since these were said to be better organized through the chambers of labor and cooperatives which they controlled. These same elements were later to argue, with just as much vehemence, that P.R. made a stable majority impossible and thus served to weaken parliamentary institutions. See Bonfigli, *La legge elettorale italiana*, p. 22.

[8] For a close analysis of the 1919 law, see Montalcini and Alberti, *Legge elettorale politica* (cited in n. 2).

with P.R.; both provided for a "premium" designed to guarantee a specific deviation from purely proportional results[9]; both were intended, according to their advocates, to save democracy by insuring a stable majority which could govern effectively. The idea of the right of the minority to an accurate representation in the legislature was accepted in 1953 as it was thirty years ago. On both occasions, however, the corresponding right of the majority to govern was asserted, and was said to have precedence in the event that the two rights should clash.

The opposition to the 1923 legislation was led by Socialists and Catholics alike. De Gasperi himself, on a number of occasions, gave expression to the Popular party's objections to the Fascist proposal.[10] But when the Popular party shifted its position from one of opposition to that of compromise, and the Socialists insisted on maintaining a doctrinaire, suicidal attitude toward participation in government, Mussolini had his way without encountering serious difficulties. The Acerbo Law passed in November, 1923, and the elections of the following year returned to Parliament a Fascist party fattened by the premium out of all proportion to its electoral strength.

Most of what followed has been told many times in treatises regarding the nature of Mussolini's state. Suffice it to say here that by 1928 the Fascists had established their own idea of representation based on corporations, and by 1939 had suppressed the Chamber of Deputies completely and replaced it with the Chamber of Fasci in which all notions of an election—even of the Fascist brand—had disappeared. The rubber stamp created in 1939 was the last legislature under Fascism.

The fall of Fascism was followed by a widespread reaction against the Monarchy, which had cooperated with the old regime, and by a general feeling that the new order should be democratically created. It was natural, therefore, that the "institutional question" should be made a matter of public referendum and that a Constituent Assembly should be created to translate the popular will into a new fundamental law. As is well known, on June 2, 1946, the voters rejected the Monarchy and created such an Assembly to draft the new republic's constitution and to govern the country during the interim. The delegates to the Constituent were chosen under a simple-quotient system of P.R., which included a national college for purposes of utilizing remainders. For the first time in Italy's history, a constitution was to be drafted by popular representatives. Also novel for the country was the fact that all male and female citizens, 21 years or older, were given the suffrage.[11]

---

[9] The Christian Democrats justifiably insisted that the Left was wrong in calling the recent law a carbon copy of the Acerbo Law. While the latter granted two-thirds of the seats to the party receiving a plurality of the vote, the former demanded that a group of joined parties get at least 50% plus one of the valid votes cast before it could benefit by the premium.

On the other hand, it is a sophism to speak of the Scelba Law as an "integrated" or "corrected" system of P.R., since most of what has been traditionally accepted as going into the meaning of P.R. is destroyed in the application of the system.

[10] A De Gasperi motion, approved at the Fourth Congress of the Popular party, pledged the party's cooperation with the Fascist Government, but also bound the membership to a rigid defense of P.R. A few days later, De Gasperi criticized the Acerbo Law with the comment that political rights and principles were not to be based on the "opportunism of a political moment." See *La proporzionale in Italia* (Rome, 1953), pp. 3–11 (a Left-wing propaganda pamphlet with no other bibliographical data, available at Liberia Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe Oscure, Rome; the pamphlet is useful in that it contains quotations concerning P.R. and the Acerbo Law from many of Italy's most prominent past and present statesmen).

The Constituent Assembly may well have set the pattern for postwar parliamentary behavior in Italy. Where there should have been cooperation, serious division—which often took the form of physical combat among the delegates—became apparent almost immediately. Aside from the normal ideological differences which separated the major parties in the Assembly, the harsh peace terms which were being hammered out by the Allies in 1946 did not help to create an atmosphere of calm deliberation within the Assembly. Given the important nature of these divisions, it is remarkable that the Draft Commission of 75 members could put together the terms of the new Constitution as quickly as it did, albeit that document has now become notorious for the neutralizing compromises which it contains in many critical areas.

As for the future electoral system, there was general agreement that the lower chamber should be chosen by P.R. Even the Christian Democratic party, already under fire from the Communists and the Socialists, did not see fit to depart from the P.R. tradition of its forerunner, the Popular party. The only issue on which there occurred a notable discussion concerned the embodiment of the P.R. principle into the Constitution. In the final balloting, however, the Assembly agreed to accept a recommendation of the sub-committee which had dealt with the electoral problem. The committee's resolution bound the Assembly to draft a P.R. law for the next elections but, for technical and other reasons, left future legislatures free to modify the electoral regulations without having to amend the Constitution.[12] The law which was finally adopted was similar to the 1946 legislation governing the elections to the Constituent Assembly.[13]

[11] Certain classes of ex-Fascists were excluded, as they are today, from complete political privileges. For an account of the precise regulations governing this election, see Bonfigli, *La legge elettorale italiana*, pp. 39–46. Although the present Monarchist party periodically demands an investigation of the 1946 balloting on the grounds that the results were fraudulent and invalid, there is no reason for believing that the majority vote was not cast against the Monarchy. Umberto II, when he accused the government of assuming power arbitrarily and then made his precipitous departure from Italy, did not render a service to his country.

[12] See *Atti Parlamentari* (cited in n. 2), pp. 95–96. In view of this decision, it would appear that the Communist-Socialist claim that the spirit of the Constitution enshrines P.R. is a stretched and wishful interpretation of the document. The Constitution specifically provides only that "The Chamber of Deputies is elected by direct, universal suffrage in the ratio of one deputy for every 80,000 inhabitants, or fraction thereof exceeding 40,000." *Constitution*, 1948, Article 56.

[13] The law provides for a list system of P.R. with a preference of three or four votes, depending on the number of deputies to be elected within a district. Seats are assigned to 31 districts on the basis of the population ratio provided by the Constitution. In 30 of

Drafting a law for the Senate did not prove as simple. More time was consumed in connection with this problem than with any other confronting the Assembly. The Left generally supported the theory that there should be no great difference between the upper and lower chambers and opposed the idea of two different electoral laws. At the most, the Communist and Socialist parties were willing to recognize only the distinctions in voting and eligibility ages which were eventually incorporated into the law.[14] On the other hand, there were many who wanted to avoid a Senate which would be nothing more than a duplicate of the Chamber of Deputies, and the age and eligibility differences were not considered sufficient to create the marked contrast which was sought.

In the early phases of the discussion the Christian Democrats came forward with a plan which was essentially corporative in nature, in that representation was to be based on professional categories of the society, including the non-economic. Having met with defeat on this proposal, they joined forces with the Republicans and were successful in forcing the opposition to accept a law which takes the major regions of Italy into consideration in apportioning seats and which attempts a fusion of the uninominal and P.R. principles.[15] The uninominal system, however, applies only in the event that a candidate receives 65 per cent or more of the votes cast in the college in which he presents himself. Barring this, the college is combined with all the others in the region in which the 65 per cent rule has not been applied, and the d'Hondt method of P.R. is used for apportioning the seats among the lists or groups of allied candidates.[16]

---

these districts, a simple-quotient method is used for purposes of distributing the seats among the competing lists. The 31st district is the Valle d'Aosta, for which a special uninominal system has been established. Remainders from the 30 districts are gathered in a National College in which seats are assigned on the basis of a national quotient. No party which has failed to elect at least one deputy in a normal constituency can profit from the operation of the National College.

All citizens 21 years or older can vote, and any citizen 25 or older can be a candidate, except for certain classes of diplomats, public officials and ex-Fascists who are excluded. See *Testo unico delle leggi per la elezione della Camera dei Deputati, 5 febbraio 1948, n. 26, Gazzetta ufficiale,* No. 30, February 6, 1948, Articles 1–3, 5, 7–8, 10–11, 42, 59–60 and Title VI.

[14] A candidate for the Senate must have reached his fortieth birthday, while the voting age for this body was raised from 21 to 25 years. *Constitution,* 1948, Article 58.

[15] The regional principle was written into the Constitution and provides that seats shall be apportioned in the ratio of one to every 200,000 inhabitants or fraction thereof exceeding 100,000. Each region, however, is entitled to at least six senators, except for the Valle d'Aosta which is assigned one. *Constitution,* 1948, Article 57.

[16] The law permits candidates of different parties to combine for purposes of the P.R. system. In addition to applying the d'Hondt method, the regional Electoral Office must prepare a graduated list of the candidates in each group in order to make the actual assignments. This is done by multiplying the individual candidate's total vote by 100 and dividing the result by the total number of registered voters of the college in which the candidacy occurred.

If the 65% rule has been applied to all but one college within a region, the remaining college is treated as a uninominal system, and the candidate with the greatest number of votes is declared elected. In case of a tie, the seat goes to the eldest candidate. The Valle d'Aosta is also treated as a uninominal district. See *Legge 6 febbraio 1948, n. 29,* in Ministero dell'Interno, *Le Leggi elettorali* (Rome, 1953), Articles 17–19, 22–23.

In the senatorial elections of 1948, only 15 of the 237 elected were able to take advantage of the uninominal provision, so that for all intents and purposes a P.R. system prevailed for this chamber as well. Nevertheless, the differences between the laws were important and resulted in a Senate party division which differed from that of the Chamber. Adding to this difference was the fact that the Senate also included 107 "Senators by right," who were appointed under various provisions of the Constitution.[17]

II

In the elections of 1948 the Christian Democrats returned absolute majorities to both chambers under the electoral legislation passed by the Constituent Assembly. Although no serious complaints were voiced against the system in the early years of the last legislature, the atmosphere of acceptance or acquiescence was to be short lived. Early in 1952 rumors began to circulate regarding a move on the part of the Government to introduce fundamental modifications in the P.R. law governing the Chamber of Deputies. By late summer the Government had spelled out both the mechanics of the new proposal and the rationale which lay behind it.

It is not the purpose of this paper to analyze in great detail the arguments presented by the competing factions in and out of Parliament. I do wish to emphasize, however, that what transpired in Italy during the six-month period preceding the June elections would make invaluable material for a first-rate study in political behavior. I would suggest that behind the façade of emotion-provoking words such as liberty, democracy, freedom, dictatorship, clerical government, the general interest, etc., lay a very fundamental group struggle in Italian society which was basically responsible for the introduction of the new legislation and for the reaction of the parties who opposed it. A careful analysis of what took place would quickly reveal that much more than a theory of representation was involved in the long debate of the Christian Democratic proposal. Political theory was more often used as a gloss and rarely revealed, for example, the impact of present international conditions on the domestic policy of the Italian Government.

As far as the center parties were concerned, their official justification for change can be summarized as follows: The threat to Italian democracy from the Left was still as great as it had been in 1948. Moreover, the administrative elections of 1951–52 had revealed a frightening resurgence of the political Right (the National Monarchists and the Italian Social Movement) with a consequent reduction of the Center's margin of security. If the trends of these elections were to prevail in 1953, it was obvious that the Parliament chosen under P.R. would be characterized by three power blocs, with the Center just able to muster a majority of the votes. This would mean unstable and disorderly government from which only the extremes could profit. And the fact that neither extreme really accepted the idea of a democratic state would naturally lead to attempts to destroy democracy by capitalizing on its weaknesses. In the light of this situation, the Center parties intended to enact a law which would guarantee a strong and stable majority in Parliament in the event that the Center managed to get at least 50 per cent of the total vote cast in 1953. They hoped to correct the defects of P.R. which appear in close elections by providing a "premium" of seats to the majority group. It was obvious, the Center concluded, that the only motivation which lay behind the legislation was that of saving democracy by avoiding a repetition of what had occurred in the years 1919–22.[18]

---

[17] Those who are Senators "by right" under Article 58 of the Constitution hold the position for life. These include ex-Presidents of the Republic and five citizens, of high social, scientific, literary, or artistic merit, who are named by the President of the Republic. The others held office only for the duration of the first Senate and consisted of those who had been members of the postwar Consultative Assembly, or members of the Constituent Assembly who could meet one of the following additional requirements: (1) a former President of the Assembly or of the Council of Ministers; (2) an ex-member of the Senate dissolved under Fascism; (3) a person elected to three legislatures, including the Constituent Assembly; and (4) a person imprisoned for five or more years by the special Fascist tribunal for the defense of the state. *Constitution*, 1948, Transitory Provisions, I.

The Left and Right replied that the Christian Democrats sought not only a stable government but also a means of insuring itself a majority in Parliament when it did not have one in the country. Nor was P.R. really at issue, since the Government had not raised objections to it so long as it had worked in favor of the Christian Democrats, as in 1948. The eleventh-hour changes were viewed as an immoral, undemocratic tactic whereby undue obstacles were being placed in the way of the minority in order to deprive it of the opportunity of coming to power peacefully. Above all, to scuttle P.R. was held to be in violation of both the spirit of the Constitution which embodied it and the specific sections of the fundamental law which provide that a man's vote shall be direct and equal.

These were essentially the major themes which were repeated with slight variation throughout what turned out to be the longest, bitterest, and most indecorous parliamentary debate in Italy's history as a Republic.[19] What transpired, in and out of Parliament, made a mockery of democratic institutions.[20] The Left obstructed the legislative process to the limit in the name of saving democracy against a "clerical dictatorship." The Government stretched to the breaking point both the Constitution and the procedural regulations of Parliament in order to force through the law in time for the 1953 elections. It justified some of its questionable tactics in the name of democracy, insisting that it was compelled to employ them by the dilatory activities and violence which had been provoked by the opposition in Parliament.[21] The public propaganda of the Left focussed on the idea that the Center proposal was a *legge truffa*—a swindle law—while the Center parties called the project a *legge anti-forca*—an anti-gallows law.

---

[18] The four-party accord on the law indicated that the legislation was designed "to insure the stability and efficiency of parliamentary institutions and the government, and to guarantee the ascension of the Italian people to a higher level of social justice. . . ." See Italian Democratic Socialist Party, *I socialisti democratici e la legge elettorale* (Rome, 1953), p. 5. This document also contains the party's justification for its adherence to the Christian Democratic scheme. See also *Atti Parlamentari* (cited in n. 2), pp. 2–11; *Il Popolo,* April 4–5, 1953, for major Christian Democratic arguments in favor of the modifications. For an excellent summary of the Opposition's objections to the law, see *Atti Parlamentari* (cited in n. 2), pp. 13–31, 96–122, 148–73.

[19] *Legge 31 marzo 1953, n. 148, Gazzetta ufficiale.* No. 75, March 31, 1953, occupied the Italian Parliament from October 22, 1952, to March 30, 1953. For most of this period all other legislation was tied up. Since the law was introduced by Minister Scelba, it is referred to as the Scelba Law in this paper.

It is of course too early to gauge the precise impact which the parliamentary wrangling has had on free institutions in Italy. On the other hand, it would appear to be clear that the reputation of democracy has suffered in a country which for more than two decades had been exposed to the Fascist attitude of disdain and scorn toward free government. Indeed, the comments on the debate in Parliament which appeared in the anti-Communist newspapers were reminiscent of the press attitude toward democratic institutions during the 1920–1922 period. There were frequent references to the political immaturity of the Italians, to the need for order (*ordine* is a magic word for Italians and has sinister connotations for democracy), and to the desirability of disciplining the more "unruly" elements of Italian society.[22]

The Government must have realized that the debate on its proposal would be heated and the opposition rigid, although later developments indicated that it had had no idea how successful the Left would be in delaying the legislation. In fact, the Communists and the Socialists gave advance notice that they would use all the legal means at their disposal in Parliament in order to prevent the law's passage.[23] One is led to wonder, therefore, what it was that caused the Christian Democrats to go ahead with the law's introduction, and to take this action so late in the term of the outgoing Chamber. The answer to the late introduction appears to lie in the initial hostility to the proposal which existed not only within the minor parties, with which the Christian Democrats were forced to negotiate for three months before reaching an agreement, but also within the ranks of the Government party itself.[24]

---

[20] An objective view of what transpired can best be gleaned from a reading of the Parliamentary record, and of the following party newspapers over the period beginning in May, 1952, and extending through the elections of June 7–8, 1953: *Il Popolo* (DC); *La Giustizia* (PSDI); *La Voce Repubblicana* (PRI); *Il Giornale d'Italia* (PLI); *L'Unità* (PCI); *Avanti!* (PSI); *Lotta Politica* (MSI). The so-called independent newspapers, including *Corriere della Sera* of Milan, are not independent at all and distort fact as much as the party organs do. With the latter, however, one knows in advance what to expect.

[21] See *Il Popolo*, January 17, 1953, p. 1; *La Giustizia*, January 22, 1953, p. 1. De Gasperi himself recognized that it was abnormal for the Government to make a law a matter of confidence when it was absolutely certain of a majority in Parliament. Moreover, there was something incongruous in the Christian Democratic position that the facts that the law finally passed and that it was designed to save Italy against Togliatti made it constitutional. See *Il Popolo*, January 22, 1953, p. 1. For specific examples of the kind of pressure applied by the majority in Parliament, see *Il Popolo*, January 12, February 13, and March 22, 1953; *L'Unità*, February 12, March 25, and April 1, 1953; *Corriere della Sera*, March 30, 1953.

[22] Typical of this attitude was a mid-March comment by *Tempo*, one of Rome's more conservative organs. "In fact," ran the paper's argument, "if the present democratic state has safeguarded the public order, in the sense that it has prevented a conflict of armed forces, preventing armed bands and audacity on the part of the people, De Gasperi however finds himself today in the same conditions which confronted Mussolini in 1923: faced with the necessity of stabilizing and perpetuating a situation of order by relying more on the energy, courage and decisions of men than on the equilibrium and harmony of things."

The cause of the introduction itself must be sought in the administrative elections of 1951 and 1952. The former elections, which were confined almost entirely to the northern provinces, undoubtedly created some concern in the Christian Democratic hierarchy, since they revealed significant reductions in the party vote even in such Catholic strongholds as the regions of Veneto and Friuli-Venezia Giulia. But the figures were not excessively ominous and the Christian Democrats might have been counting on retaining the major part of its strength in the South where, in 1948, it had received over 50 per cent of the total vote cast while the Left just managed to get over the 20 per cent mark. But when the results were in for the twenty-five central and southern provinces which chose administrative councils in 1952, the concern of 1951 turned into hysteria in several quarters. The Left had made some gains almost everywhere; the Right, and especially the Italian Social Movement, had jumped markedly; the Christian Democrats had experienced a serious electoral defeat.[25] In provinces such as Naples, Salerno, Rome, Perugia and Terni, the vote loss ranged from 40 to 62 per cent of the 1948 totals. Even in Sicily the party lost 337,000 votes, or 37 per cent of its 1948 strength. The comparative figures for the 1948 and 1951–52 elections are shown in Table I.

In light of the above figures, one can appreciate the Christian Democratic compulsion to stop and, if possible, to reverse the trend. Less understandable, given the fact that the Republican party was the only minor party to record a decrease (and it was slight) in 1951–52, was the participation of the Liberal, Democratic and Republican parties in the Christian Democratic plan

---

[23] See *Corriere della Sera,* October 29, 1952, p. 1.

[24] As late as June 24, 1952, there was division in the National Council of the DC party over the advisability of modifying P.R. See an account of the disposition of a De Gasperi motion expressing the need for a new electoral law in *Avanti!*, June 25, 1952, p. 1. The minor parties, in addition to their own internal divisions over the proposed change, were interested in guaranteeing that whatever scheme was finally adopted would not give the DC an absolute majority in the new Chamber. *Corriere della Sera,* November 1, 1952, p. 1, carries a good analysis of the reason for delay.

[25] In the 25 provinces involved, the Social Movement jumped from 3.53% of the total vote in 1948 to 13.7% in 1952. For the National Monarchists, the figures were 3.24% and 8.81% respectively. See Vol. 2 of the election statistics cited in n. 3. These figures were procured from data which the Ministry of Interior has not yet released for public consumption.

TABLE I. PARTY STRENGTH AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL VALID VOTES CAST

Party	General Elections 1948	Administrative Elections 1951–1952
Center		
Christian Democrat	48.5	35.5
Democratic Socialist	7.1	7.3
Liberal	3.8	3.8
Republican	2.5	2.3
Center Independent*		1.0
	61.9	49.9
Left		
Communist-Socialist	31.0	32.7
Left Independent†		1.9
	31.0	34.6
Right		
Social Movement	2.0	6.9
National Monarchist	2.8	4.5
	4.8	11.4
Others	2.3	4.1

* Allied with one or more of the Center parties.
† Allied with Communists, Socialists, or both.

Source: Election statistics cited in note 3, pp. 128–35; Istituto Centrale di Statistica, *Bollettino Mensile di Statistica,* Vol. 26, pp. 33–35 (Sept., 1951), and Vol. 26, p. 27 (Oct., 1951).

The methods whereby certain leaders within these parties managed to bring their groups into the Christian Democratic camp would make for a most interesting and revealing study. The documentation for such a project would be materially assisted by the fact that there were differences of opinion regarding the electoral reform which were publicly expressed and which led to resignations and/or schisms in all of the minor parties prior to the elections. Even a cursory reading of the press leads one to the conclusion that more was involved than governmental stability and the preservation of democracy. Seats in Parliament, patronage, internal struggles for power, personal friendships or animosities, tactical party strategy and myriad other inarticulated but vitally important factors helped to shape the decisions which were eventually reached. Only when these factors have been adequately catalogued and analyzed can one begin to make meaningful statements about the behavior of these complex organizations.

The one completely unexpected development—one which threatened to wipe out the minor party advantages under the Scelba Law—occurred with the dissolution of the Senate shortly after the new electoral law was finally approved by the upper house. The Government and "independent" press had rumored and favored this development on the theory that the debate in the Senate had created a permanent rift which would make its functioning in the future extremely difficult. This argument was manifestly weak, since a close election, which would necessarily take place under the 1948 law, would result in a precarious Center majority. The other reason put forward was that a Senate election within another year would be both wasteful and unwanted by the electorate.[26]

The matter of dissolution raised two problems for the minor parties. In the first place, they faced the loss of their "Senators by right," the number of which had equalled or exceeded the number of Senators they had elected in 1948. This in turn could lead to the possibility of a future Senate in which the Center majority would be so narrow that the Christian Democrats would be compelled to cooperate with the Monarchists, and perhaps the neo-Fascists, in order to govern. Although the minor parties split internally on the question, the leaders in favor of going along with the Christian Democrats prevailed. Theoretically, the latter are supposed to have promised to settle the "Senators by right" question as soon as possible after the elections. In addition, there was optimistic talk about cooperation among the Center parties in the distribution of uncontested Senate candidacies. The latter hope turned out to be an illusion, and little cooperation took place in fact. Strong factions in the Christian Democratic party were opposed to making Senate seats available to the minor allies in order to keep their favor. These elements were in a strong position since the Scelba Law was already a matter of record.

The dissolution was viewed as a tactical error in many quarters because of its manifest tendency to create animosities among the Center parties. More important was the possibility that the step would nullify the effect of the Scelba Law, in the sense that Parliament would be just as easily paralyzed in the Senate should the elections be close. It was felt that such an eventuality would lead either to another dissolution of the Senate or to a Right coalition in Parliament, with all of the negative consequences for the four-party agreement which the latter step would surely involve.[27] It may well be that Alcide De Gasperi took the step because of a sincere conviction that the institutions of democracy had been too blatantly attacked and insulted in the Senate to permit that body to live out its term. It is also possible that the Prime Minister's decision was based on the consideration that the simultaneous elections of both chambers would keep the polling places open for two full days instead of the single day authorized by the Scelba Law. The assumption which the Christian Democrats have always made is that a large vote operates in their favor. This and some of the other theories and assumptions suggested above can now be subjected to an empirical analysis in the light of what actually transpired at the polls.

---

[26] See *Giornale d'Italia*, April 1, 1953, p. 1. As early as December 6, 1952, *Mondo Economico* posed the problem of maintaining staggered terms for the two houses, holding that there was little logic in having the Senate recess for almost four months during the 1953 campaign and the Chamber for a like period during 1954. Suspending legislation over such lengthy periods was considered to be dangerous by this journal.

[27] See *La Nazione* (Florence), April 26, 1953, p. 1; April 30, 1953, p. 1.

III

Over twenty-seven million Italians went to the polls in 1953, and they upset a number of theories which had been suggested regarding the anticipated results. In the first place, contrary to many predictions, an extraordinarily high level of participation did not insure a victory for the Center. Tables II and III, which summarize the election returns of 1948 and 1953, show that the Center parties did not do as well in 1953 as they had done in 1948 in spite of the higher percentage turnout (93.7 per cent in 1953 as compared with 92.5 per cent in 1948). Conceivably the losses might have been greater if large numbers of electors had neglected the ballot boxes, since the Christian Democrats obtained a surprisingly low 35.5 per cent of the votes cast in 1951–52 (Table I), when only 89 per cent of the eligible voters participated. On the basis of available data, however, it is not possible to test the validity of this hypothesis.

TABLE II. RESULTS OF THE CHAMBER ELECTIONS OF 1948 AND 1953

	Total Valid Votes					Deputies Elected				
	1948		1953		% Change	1948		1953		% Change
	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	No.	%	
DC	12,712,562	48.5	10,859,554	40.09	−8.41	304	53.1	262	44.4	−8.7
PRI	652,477	2.5	437,889	1.6	−0.9	9	1.6	5	0.8	−0.8
PSDI	1,858,346	7.1	1,223,870	4.5	−2.6	33	5.8	19	3.2	−2.6
PLI	1,004,889	3.8	815,681	3.0	−0.8	19	3.3	14	2.4	−0.9
PCI*	8,137,047	31.0	6,122,638	22.6	+4.3	183	31.9	143	24.2	+6.0
PSI*			3,440,222	12.7				75	12.7	
UP			171,177	0.6						
IS			225,410	0.8						
PNM	729,174	2.8	1,856,661	6.9	+4.1	14	2.4	40	6.8	+4.4
MSI	526,670	2.0	1,580,395	5.8	+3.8	6	1.0	29	5.0	+4.0
ADN			120,555	0.5						
PEASANT	96,025	0.4				1	0.2			
PPST	124,385	0.5	122,810	0.5		3	0.5	3	0.5	
PSDA	61,919	0.2	27,224	0.01	−0.19	1	0.2	0	0	−0.2
OTHERS	316,656	1.2	85,088	0.4	−0.8					
Totals:	26,220,150	100.0	27,089,184	100.0		573	100.0	590	100.0	

* PCI and PSI were combined in all constituencies under the label "Democratic Popular Front."
The heading "OTHERS" includes 32 minor parties in 1948, and 18 minor parties in 1953.
Valle d'Aosta, with uninominal system, excluded in 1948 totals.

KEY TO NAMES OF PARTIES (TABLES II–IX):

DC:	Christian Democratic Party	PNM:	National Monarchist Party
PCI:	Italian Communist Party	MSI:	Italian Social Movement
PSI:	Italian Socialist Party (Pietro Nenni)	ADN:	Democratic Alliance
PSDI:	Italian Democratic Socialist Party (Giuseppe Saragat)	IS:	Independent Socialists
		UP:	Popular Unity
PLI:	Italian Liberal Party	PSDA:	Sardinian Action Party
PRI:	Italian Republican Party	PPST:	South Tyrol Popular Party

TABLE III. RESULTS OF THE SENATE ELECTIONS OF 1948 AND 1953

	Total Valid Votes					Senators Elected				
	1948		1953		% Change	1948		1953		% Change
	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	No.	%	
DC	10,899,640	48.0	9,854,754	40.7	−7.3	131	55.3	116	48.9	−6.4
PRI	594,178	2.6	225,611	0.9	−1.7	4	1.7	0	0	−1.7
PSDI	943,219	4.2	988,778	4.1	−0.1	6	2.5	4	1.7	−0.8
PRI-PSDI	610,660	2.7				6	2.5			
PLI	1,216,934	5.4	720,698	3.0	−2.4	10	4.2	3	1.3	−1.1
PCI			5,080,143	20.9				54	22.7	
PSI			2,929,906	12.1				28	11.8	
PCI-PSI*	6,982,601	30.9	418,940	1.7	+3.8	72	30.4	4	1.7	+5.8
UP			230,370	1.0						
PNM	393,510	1.7	1,734,275	7.1	+5.4	4	1.7	16	6.8	+5.1
MSI	164,092	0.7	1,482,101	6.1	+5.4	1	0.4	9	3.8	+3.4
ADN			197,482	0.8				1	0.4	
OTHERS†	852,456	3.8	396,488	1.6	−2.2	3	1.3	2	0.9	−0.4
Totals:	22,657,290	100.0	24,299,546	100.0		237	100.0	237	100.0	

* PCI and PSI were combined in all constituencies under the label "Democratic Popular Front" in 1948, but in 1953 they were combined in only three regions.

† The heading "OTHERS" includes 32 minor parties in 1948, and 18 minor parties in 1953.

Secondly, it should be noted that the Center parties won in the Senate and lost in the Chamber elections by very narrow margins. A shift of only 57,000 votes (0.2 per cent) in favor of the Center would have caused the premium provisions of the Scelba Law to go into operation. Under such circumstances the makeup of the Chamber would have differed markedly from what it turned out to be under the operation of the 1948 P.R. system which remained in effect.[28] In addition, the distribution of the national majority seats among the various constituencies would have resulted in the Center parties' receiving a majority of the seats in many constituencies in which they constituted the minority.[29] Such a consequence could be averted only if the entire country were treated as a single constituency, with no effort being made to assign representatives geographically on the basis of population.

Thirdly, although the Right made impressive gains over 1948, the decline of the Italian Social Movement (MSI) from 6.9 per cent in 1951–52 (Table I) to 5.0 per cent in 1953 should be underlined. Major internal divisions within the party, which became pronounced before the elections, affected its performance adversely. On the other hand, the National Monarchist party secured more support than had been generally expected. An almost purely local situation which will be explained below accounts for the strong showing of the Monarchy. (See Tables II and III.)

---

[28] If the Center parties had just managed to squeeze through with a majority, the 380 seats assigned to the majority group under the Scelba Law would have been distributed as follows: DC, 306; PSDI, 34; PLI, 23; PRI, 12; South Tyrol Popular Party, 4; Sardinian Action Party, 1. For the minority parties, the 209 seats would have been assigned as follows: PCI, 93; PSI, 53; PNM, 29; MSI, 24; IS, 4; UP, 3; ADN, 2. Cf. the actual distribution under P.R. in Table II.

[29] This tendency to distort arbitrarily the constituency situation becomes pronounced under the Scelba Law in a close election. The complicated mathematics of the law need not be demonstrated in order to prove this. One need only bear in mind that distortion resulting from the distribution of a premium of 380 seats varies in inverse proportion to the gap which separates the majority and minority groups. This was only one of many bad features which the legislation contained.

Contrary to many prognostications, the Left was not hurt by its determined obstruction of the Scelba Law or by the many political strikes which it called as a method of parliamentary coercion. The Communists and Socialists made gains everywhere, even in some of the most important Catholic Christian Democratic strongholds in the country. In a sense, the Left is correct in claiming that the elections constituted a popular referendum on the new electoral law. The electoral campaign was fought largely on the issue of P.R., and the voters rendered a somewhat surprising although not entirely unexpected judgment.

Lastly, the most striking aspect of the returns lay in the poor performances of the minor Center parties. The extent of the setbacks suffered is best seen in Tables I, II, and III. The Liberal and Democratic Socialist parties, which had either maintained or improved their positions in 1951–52 over 1948, were weakened significantly in 1953. In the case of the Republican party, the defeat was so overwhelming as to raise the question whether it remains a significant party in contemporary Italy.

Let us now turn to the interesting geographic variations in strength among the major parties. Tables IV and V provide a general picture of the positions of the respective political groupings within the major subdivisions of the country. One important observation to be made at the outset is that the position of the Christian Democrats in the Senate contests is not consistently superior to that of the lower house. On the other hand, both the Communists and the Socialists generally bring more voters into their columns in the Chamber races than in those for the Senate. Nevertheless, it does not appear justifiable to argue, as do many persons in Italy, that the voters in the age group 21–25 are inclined to be more extremist in their political thinking than are their elder co-nationals. The Center would have had to enjoy more superior advantages in the Senate races before credence could be ascribed to this theory. Instead, in the case of the extreme Right, the 1953 results clearly point up the fact that both the Italian Social Movement and the National Monarchists achieved better results in the Senate races, in which the vote is extended only to those who are 25 years of age or older. Italian youth, then, does not appear to deviate radically in its political thinking and behavior from the pattern established by the older age groups. It would of course be much more valuable for analytical purposes to have a picture of the voting patterns of all age groups in Italy, but the data for this are not available. The subjection of a carefully controlled sample of the population to intensive depth interviews would be one way of testing this hypothesis.

TABLE IV. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PARTY VOTES BY MAJOR GEOGRAPHICAL SUBDIVISIONS

Chamber of Deputies

	North			Central			South			Insular						Italy		
										Sicily			Sardinia					
	1948	1953	% Change	1948	1953	% Change	1948	1953	% Change	1948	1953	% Change	1948	1953	% Change	1948	1953	% Change
DC	49.3	43.1	−6.2	44.5	36.3	−8.2	50.2	38.6	−11.6	47.8	36.4	−11.4	51.2	41.7	−9.5	48.5	40.1	−8.4
PRI	1.6	1.3	−0.3	5.7	3.0	−2.7	1.7	1.2	− 0.5	3.0	1.6	− 1.4	0.6	0.5	−0.1	2.5	1.6	−0.9
PSDI	10.0	6.4	−3.6	5.2	3.5	−1.7	3.5	2.4	− 1.1	4.9	2.5	− 2.4	3.7	2.3	−1.4	7.1	4.5	−2.6
PLI	1.5	2.8	+1.3	1.7	2.1	+0.4	8.7	3.6	− 5.1	7.9	4.6	− 3.3	8.7	2.8	−5.9	3.8	3.0	−0.8
PCI		21.2			28.3			21.2			21.8			21.2			22.6	
PSI		15.4			14.1			8.4			7.5			9.0			12.7	
PCI-PSI*	33.8		+2.8	38.4		+4.0	23.7		+ 5.9	20.9		+ 8.4	20.3		+9.9	31.0		+4.3
UP		0.9			0.6			0.1									0.6	
IS		0.7			0.7			0.9			1.1						0.8	
PNM	0.6	3.2	+2.6	1.1	3.7	+2.6	6.9	15.4	+ 8.5	8.9	11.6	+ 2.7	1.6	10.2	+8.6	2.8	6.9	+4.1
MSI	0.9	3.5	+2.6	2.4	7.3	+4.9	3.5	7.3	+ 3.8	3.2	11.8	+ 8.6	2.8	8.2	+5.4	2.0	5.8	+3.8
ADN		0.3			0.3			0.5			0.9						0.5	
PEASANT	0.7			0.1			0.1									0.4		
OTHERS†	1.6	1.2	−0.4	0.9	0.1	−0.8	1.7	0.4	− 1.3	3.4	0.2	− 3.2	11.1	4.1	−7.0	1.9	0.9	−1.0

* PCI and PSI were combined in all constituencies under the label "Democratic Popular Front."

† The heading "OTHERS" includes 34 minor parties in 1948, and 18 minor parties in 1953.

TABLE V. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PARTY VOTES BY MAJOR GEOGRAPHICAL SUBDIVISIONS

Senate

	North			Central			South			Insular						Italy		
										Sicily			Sardinia					
	1948	1953	% Change	1948	1953	% Change	1948	1953	% Change	1948	1953	% Change	1948	1953	% Change	1948	1953	% Change
DC	49.5	42.8	−6.7	45.7	37.3	−8.4	47.1	38.3	− 8.8	46.7	35.4	−11.3	49.8	43.6	− 6.2	48.0	40.7	−7.3
PRI	1.1	1.0	−0.1	7.7	3.6	−4.1	1.4	0.6	− 0.8	4.0	2.4	− 1.6				2.6	0.9	−1.7
PSDI	4.6	6.4	+1.8	3.7	2.8	−0.5	2.9	2.7	− 0.2	5.7	2.6	− 3.1	4.5	3.1	− 1.4	4.2	4.1	−0.1
PRI-PSDI	5.5															2.7		
PLI	3.0	2.9	−0.1	2.8	1.8	−1.0	12.0	4.2	− 7.8	6.5	5.4	− 1.1	10.8	†		5.4	3.0	−2.4
PCI		22.7			28.4			20.5			19.5						22.6	
PSI		14.5			13.6			6.7			7.2						12.1	
PCI-PSI*	33.9		+3.3	36.7		+3.3	23.9		+ 3.3	20.4		+ 6.3	20.1	28.2	+ 8.1	30.9		+3.8
PNM	0.1	3.0	+2.9	0.6	4.0	+3.4	3.6	16.3	+12.7	9.6	13.3	+ 3.7		10.6	+10.6	1.7	7.1	+5.4
MSI		3.4	+3.4	1.1	7.4	+6.3	1.2	8.2	+ 7.0	3.0	12.7	+ 9.7		8.6	+ 8.6	0.7	6.1	+5.4
ADN		0.5			0.3			2.2			1.5						0.8	
OTHERS	2.3	2.8	+0.5	1.7	0.8	−0.9	7.9	0.3	− 7.6	4.1		− 4.1	14.8	5.9	− 8.9	3.8	2.6	−1.2

* PCI and PSI were combined in all constituencies under the label "Democratic Popular Front."

† PLI and DC combined.

In interpreting the geographic variations in party strength, the reader should bear in mind that a regional percentage is only an average made up of the figures pertaining to each party within the specific and smaller districts comprising a region. For example, while the Christian Democratic performance illustrated by Tables IV and V is impressive for all regions, this strength is far from uniform among the electoral subdivisions. In the Chamber elections, the Demo-christians received absolute majorities of the total votes cast in the northern districts of Como-Sondrio-Varese (51.2%), Brescia-Bergamo (59.1%), Verona-Padova-Vicenza-Rovigo (55.2%), Venezia-Treviso (50.4%), Udine-Belluno-Gorizia (50.6%), and Valle d'Aosta (53.4%).[30] On the other hand, the party fell to lows of 27.1 per cent in the district of Bologna-Ferrara-Ravenna-Forlì, and 30.3 per cent in the senatorial region of Emilia-Romagna. Thus the heavy concentration of its forces in the areas singled out above has a decided impact on the general data regarding the North as a whole which is reported in Tables IV and V. The heavy Catholic vote of the centers in which it is the majority party tends to obscure its weaknesses in the northern industrial regions. In no other major regional division is the gap between the highest and lowest returns as great as it is in the North.

Some interesting observations can also be made concerning the Left. While the forces of the Communist party are generally evenly divided among the major sectors of the country (Tables IV, V), its greatest power is concentrated in the regions of Emilia-Romagna, Tuscany and Umbria. (The same is true of the Socialist party.) The significance of this fact becomes clear when one recalls the popular belief that the Left in Italy draws its greatest support from the highly industrialized North. In the four Chamber districts encompassed by the region of Tuscany, the Communists alone received from 30.2 to 39.9 per cent of the total votes cast. In addition, the Communist and Socialist parties combined obtained absolute majorities in the districts of Bologna-Ferrara-Ravenna-Florlì (51.6%), Parma-Modena-Piacenza-Reggio nell'Emilia (50.4%), Firenze-Pistoia (51.5%), and Siena-Arezzo-Grosseto (56.6%). Thus not Milan, Turin and Genoa, but the smaller, basically agricultural centers listed above appear as the most revolutionary communities in Italy. And the most radical of the revolutionaries is the *mezzadro,* the humble sharecropper who inhabits these regions! A long history of social consciousness engendered by a feudal owning class, and an ardent spirit of anti-clericalism are the reasons usually advanced in explanation of this interesting phenomenon. Here is another problem well worth serious research, for the ability of the Italian extreme Left to maintain its position in these areas and to penetrate the agricultural South promises to have a marked impact on Italian society. In fact the gains of the Left in the

---

[30] The Christian Democrats were the victims of significant losses even in these "safe" districts. In 1948 the percentages for the Chamber districts cited above were 57.6%, 66.8%, 62.3%, 57.3%, 57.8% and 59.0%, respectively. Moreover, in 1948 there were seven other districts in which they went over the 50 per cent mark but which in 1953 did not return more than 45.2 per cent, and in most cases much less than this. Essentially the same pattern emerges from a comparison of the Senate results for the two elections.

South—universally impressive in the last elections—were registered primarily by the Communist party. The abrupt manner in which the strength of the Nenni Socialists falls off in the provinces south of Rome means that they have not been able to equal the proselytizing efforts of their Communist allies in these places. The extent to which the ratio of power between the two parties becomes modified in the South is attested to by the fact that in many cases the Communists alone received percentages in 1953 which were as high or higher than the combined Communist-Socialist returns in 1948. Finally, it is worth remarking that the Left made gains over 1948 in all senatorial regions except Abruzzi-Molise and in all Chamber electoral districts except one in which the loss was only 0.4 per cent. By way of contrast, the Christian Democrats sustained losses in every region and district in Italy.

On the basis of local returns there can be no doubt that the resurgence of the political Right is overwhelmingly a southern phenomenon. The concentrations of both the Monarchist and neo-Fascist forces are located primarily in the provinces south of the capital city. The only important exceptions occur in Piedmont, where the House of Savoy still commands some sentimental attraction, and in Umbria, where the neo-Fascists have experienced a certain revival. It is to be noted that both the extreme Left and Right made important gains in the South in 1953 at the expense of the Christian Democrats primarily and of the political Center as a whole. In no other section of the country was the trend away from the Center so pronounced, and this might well be an index to widespread dissatisfaction with the Government's program, or lack of one. As a possible explanation for the growth of both extremes in the South, I would suggest the hypothesis that those Italians who are the most strongly tied to the Catholic Church express a protest vote by joining the ranks of the Monarchist or neo-Fascist parties, whereas those not so emotionally identified incline toward the Socialist and Communist parties.

The Nationalist Monarchist party looms as a much more regional or local movement than the Italian Social Movement. The former received almost 25 per cent of its total national vote in the region of Campania, more specifically, in the cities of Naples, Caserta, Benevento, Avellino and Salerno. Evidently the paternalistic symbol of the monarchy continues to have a certain attraction for the southern Italians. And although it would appear that the leaders of the party are not really agreed on the return of a monarch, they used the symbol very adroitly throughout the electoral campaign. However unless important segments of the northern and central regions can be persuaded that the popular decision of 1946 should be reversed, the monarchist movement is not likely to become a serious threat to the Italian Republic. Nevertheless, the adherence which this party was able to encourage in the South is sufficiently important to warrant some serious contemplation and action on the part of those in Italy who see in this revival something more profound than mere nostalgic reminiscing.

The Liberal party was also affected adversely by the gains made by the political extremes in the South. The chief Liberal support had come from the regions beginning with Abruzzi and extending throughout the South. The party leadership realized that the major threat would come precisely in these areas, since the Monarchists had been aiming their propaganda efforts primarily at those Liberals who also were favorable to the monarchy or who had become somewhat confused and disoriented by the lack of program and policy which had characterized the Liberal party for some time. The extent to which the Monarchists succeeded is starkly revealed by the losses which the Liberals suffered in the regions of Campania, Puglia and Calabria—62.5, 70.7 and 77.8 per cent, respectively, of the percentages obtained in 1948. Only in Abruzzi was the party able to check the ebbing tide of Italian liberalism. In general the depletion was nearly catastrophic, and only some small gains which were achieved in the North saved the party from complete destruction.

The exodus from the Republican party took place throughout the country. At Rome and the Marches, two of its previously strongest sectors, the party's 1953 percentages, as compared with those of 1948, were inferior to the extent of 59.1 and 54.4 per cent, respectively. Ground was lost even in the provinces of Ravenna and Forlì, where a long tradition of Garabaldian republicanism had served to furnish the party with enough votes to give it national status. The fact that it did not receive many more votes in 1953 than did either the Democratic Alliance or Popular Unity, neither of which had been in existence as parties prior to the spring of the year, is testimony to its near demise. It is entirely possible that, with the establishment of the Republic in 1946, the Republican party's *raison d'être* ceased to exist. An upsurge of the monarchist movement all over Italy might be the source of new life-blood for the Republicans, but if the issue of the Republic is the only positive program with which they can confront the electorate in the future, it is difficult to imagine how the party can regain its lost ground.

The Democratic Socialist party presents a somewhat different problem. The last of many schisms within this group took place over the Scelba Law and resulted in the creation of the Popular Unity party. The direct competition of this splinter group undoubtedly accounts for a portion of the Social Democratic losses, but since those who bolted received only 0.6 per cent of the total vote cast for the Chamber, and never more than 1.9 per cent of the total in any district, it is obvious that many of those who had previously supported the Democratic Socialists went elsewhere in 1953. The data available at this time suggest that in the North the shift was to the Nenni Socialists. The latter made much of their formal separation from the Communists in the elections, and it is possible that many Democratic Socialists saw more in Pietro Nenni's promises of a "Socialist alternative" than in the negative, policyless campaign conducted by Giuseppe Saragat and his followers. Conceivably, there were also many Democratic Socialists who did not approve of carrying political pragmatism to the point where the party's former rigid stand in favor of P.R. was argued away in favor of its support of the Scelba Law. In the South the situation is not as easily susceptible of analysis, since the Right made gains here equal or superior to those of the Communists and Socialists. In the region of Basilicata, for example, Democratic Socialist strength fell from 12.4 per cent in 1948 to 2.5 per cent in 1953. A portion of these votes were absorbed by the Communists and Socialists (they advanced from 25.2% to 32.7%), but others must have moved into the Monarchist and Italian Social Movement columns. Or one might offer the hypothesis that the right-wing Democratic Socialists voted for the Christian Democrats, whereas the conservatives within the latter group moved a step or two over toward the Right. In any event, it is clear that Democratic Socialism in Italy, for many reasons—complex and simple—was the object of a serious reversal, even in the central and northern provinces, where it drew on a long and highly favorable historical tradition.

From the standpoint of representation, Italy's P.R. laws operate so as to provide expression for all of the main currents in Italian political thought (see Tables II and III). An analysis of the seat distribution in both houses further amplifies the operation of P.R. in Italy, and shows that, at least in the Chamber, Italy's P.R. method is sensitive to the political differences which exist at the district levels (see Tables VI and VII). For example, the Democratic Socialist seats are largely concentrated in the northern districts, while the Liberal party depends on the southern provinces for over 70 per cent of its representation in the lower house. Still more pronounced is the concentration of the Monarchist and Social Movement deputies in the South. The Christian Democrats and the Communists are obviously the strongest parties in both houses. The former obtained some representation in all of the electoral constituencies for both houses in 1953, while the latter failed completely only in one Chamber district (VIII) and in the senatorial region of Trentino-Alto-Adige. In addition Valle d'Aosta, where a plurality system prevails, was won by the Christian Democrats in both instances.

In the Senate there were ten different parties represented in 1953, but for all intents and purposes the number is eight, since the two South Tyrol Popular party senators vote consistently with the Christian Democrats, and the single Senator representing the Democratic Alliance from Campania owes his seat to the support received from the Left parties. The same number of parties is found in the present Chamber, the South Tyrol Popular Party having secured three deputies in District VIII and the Sardinian Peoples party one deputy in District XXX. All of the major parties returned at least one deputy only in District XIX, which includes the city of Rome, while in the Senate only in the regions of Piedmont, Lombardy, Campania and Sicily are six parties or more represented. On the whole, a greater atomization of the vote takes place in the South than in any other part of the country. The average number of parties represented from the thirty Chamber districts is 4.6 in 1953, compared to 3.4 in 1948. This difference, however, stems largely from the fact that the Communists and the Socialists entered the lists as separate parties in 1953. Lastly, one should note the tendency toward a two-party system which exists in the regions of Emilia-Romagna, Tuscany, and Umbria. These are areas in which the level of political maturity is considered to be very high, and where the battle lines between the Christian Democrats and the Left are clearly and rigidly drawn.

TABLE VI. SEAT DISTRIBUTION IN THE CHAMBER BY ELECTORAL DISTRICTS, 1948 AND 1953

District:	I		II		III		IV		V		VI		VII		VIII		IX		X		XI		XII		XIII		XIV		XV		XVI		XVII	
Year:	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53
DC	13	11	9	8	9	8	18	16	9	9	14	12	5	5	5	5	19	17	10	10	9	9	7	7	7	7	6	5	7	6	3	3	9	8
PCI*	10	7	4	3	8	5	14	8	4	2	4	2	5	2	1	—	7	4	4		3	2	13	10	10	8	7	6	7	5	6	5	6	4
PSI	—	4	—	2	—	3	—	7	—	3	—	3	—	3	—	—	—	4	—	3	—	2	—	3	—	3	—	2	—	2	—	2	—	3
PNM	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
MSI	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
PLI	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
PSDI	3	2	2	1	2	1	4	2	1	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
PRI	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—
OTHERS	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Totals:	26	26	16	16	19	17	36	36	14	15	19	18	10	10	9	8	28	28	16	16	14	15	24	22	19	19	13	13	15	13	9	10	17	15

TABLE VI (*continued*)

District:	XVIII		XIX		XX		XXI		XXII		XXIII		XXIV		XXV		XXVI		XXVII		XXVIII		XXIX		XXX		XXXI		N.C.		Totals	
Year:	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	1948	1953	1948	1535
DC	5	4	20	15	10	7	5	3	17	12	11	8	12	9	9	8	4	4	13	11	15	10	13	11	9	7	1	1	4	6	305	262
PCI	6	3	10	10	5	4	—	1	7	7	3	4	7	6	4	4	2	2	8	6	5	6	6	6	3	4	—	—	4	5	183	143
PSI	—	3	—	3	—	1	—	—	—	2	—	1	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	3	—	2	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	5	—	75
PNM	—	—	—	3	—	1	—	—	4	7	2	5	1	4	1	2	—	1	—	2	2	3	2	3	—	1	—	—	2	5	14	40
MSI	—	1	—	4	—	1	—	—	1	2	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	1	2	—	3	1	3	—	1	—	—	2	6	6	29
PLI	—	—	1	1	—	—	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	—	2	—	—	—	2	1	2	1	2	—	1	—	—	—	3	4	19	14
PSDI	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	5	33	19
PRI	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	2	3	9	5
OTHERS	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	5	3
Totals:	11	11	35	38	16	14	6	5	31	31	18	20	22	22	16	16	6	7	24	25	26	25	25	25	14	14	1	1	21	39	574	590

* PCI-PSI combined in 1948.

TABLE VII. SEAT DISTRIBUTION IN THE SENATE BY REGIONS, 1948 AND 1953

	Piedmont		Valle d'Aosta		Lombardy		Trentino-Alto Adige		Veneto		Friuli Venezia Giulia		Liguria		Emilia Romagna		Tuscany		Umbria		Marches		Lazio		Abruzzi		Molise		Campania		Puglia		Basilicata		Calabria		Sicily		Sardinia	
	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53*	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53	48	53
DC	8	8	1	1	18	16	4	4	14	12	4	4	4	4	6	6	7	6	3	2	4	4	10	8	4	5	2	—	11	9	8	7	3	3	5	5	12	8	3	4
PCI	—	4	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	3	—	1	—	3	—	7	—	6	—	2	—	2	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	4	—	2	—	2	—	5	—	—
PSI	—	2	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	3	—	1	—	1	—	3	—	3	—	2	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	2	—	—
PCI-PSI†	6	—	—	—	10	—	—	—	4	—	1	—	3	—	9	—	7	—	3	—	2	—	5	—	2	2	—	—	4	—	5	—	2	—	3	—	5	—	1	2
PNM	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	2	5	—	2	—	1	—	1	2	3	—	—
MSI	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	3	—	—
PLI	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	2	—	—	—	2	—	1	1	1	—
PSDI	2	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
PRI	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
PSDI-PRI	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
OTHERS	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
Totals:	17	17	1	1	31	31	6	6	19	19	6	6	8	8	17	17	15	15	6	6	7	7	16	16	6	8	2	—	21	21	15	15	6	6	10	10	22	22	6	6

* Abruzzi and Molise constituted one region in 1953.

† PCI-PSI combined in 1948.

Some distortion of the results occurs under both electoral laws, and to a greater degree in the Senate where the d'Hondt method, which favors the strongest parties, is used. Further distortion results in the Senate from the application of the 65 per cent uninominal rule, which cancels out the votes of the minority parties in the colleges where it is applied.[31] In the Chamber the distortion was not as great, although a completely equitable system of utilizing remainders under P.R. has yet to be devised. The requirement of the Italian system that a party must have elected at least one deputy in a normal constituency before it can take advantage of the distribution of remainders in the National College, left without any seats the Democratic Alliance, Popular Unity, and Independent Socialist parties—all of which helped to defeat the Scelba Law, under the application of which they would have received a few places in the Chamber. In spite of this the system is not subject to serious criticism from a P.R. standpoint, albeit the advocates of a majoritarian structure may deplore the tendency of any P.R. device to reflect too accurately the political nuances which divide the electorate.

One major criticism which has been raised regarding the Senate system has to do with the provision which takes into consideration the relative performance of each candidate within the college in which he ran. Thus, after the seats to be distributed have been ascribed to the various party groups according to the method of d'Hondt, the actual assignments are made on the basis of a graduated list of candidates within each group which is not based on total votes alone. Thus if Candidate "A" with 15,000 votes received a greater percentage of the total vote cast within his college than Candidate "B" who obtained 60,000 votes within his college, the former will appear higher on the graduated list than the latter. It is said that this system penalizes the man who runs within a district where the turnout is high. Fortunately the instances of its application are so rare as to warrant press and other comment when it does occur.

The deviations from a pure P.R. distribution become much more pronounced when the results within each district are observed. An analysis of the percentage vote and seat distribution among the parties which competed in the Chamber elections of 1948 and 1953 makes two things immediately apparent: the strongest parties (Christian Democrats and Communists) enjoy a decided advantage in the distribution of seats; and the National College does not remove the deficiency which the minor parties suffer unless a minor party has some strong regional strength, as is the case of the Social Movement and the Monarchists. Except for two districts in 1948 (XII and XIII) in which the Christian Democrats received a higher vote than seat percentage, their seat advantage in both elections never falls below 0.8 per cent and is usually much above that. If the votes and seats of the Christian Democrats and the Communists are added together, the extent of the distortion is pointed up most clearly. Yet if seats are to be apportioned on the basis of population within specific districts, this kind of deviation from pure P.R. is to be expected. It is well known that a proportional assignment of seats on the basis of a single national district comes closest to giving a perfectly accurate reflection of the votes which have been cast for competing parties. Table VIII compares the present Italian system with what the results would have been under such a pure form of P.R.

---

[31] In 1948, 15 Senators were elected under this provision. The 1953 results reflect the decline of the Christian Democrats, for they were able to take advantage of the rule in only four colleges as compared to fourteen in 1948. These four Senators came from the regions of Lombardy, Trentino-Alto Adige (2) and Veneto. In another Trentino college, the South Tyrol Popular party elected a Senator with 83.4% of the total vote!

TABLE VIII. COMPARISON OF SEAT DISTRIBUTION UNDER PRESENT SYSTEM AND PURE P.R.

Party	Votes	Remainder	Seats Now	Seats P.P.R.	Difference
DC	10,859,554	43,850*	262	237	−25
PCI	6,122,638	44,248*	143	136	− 7
PSI	3,440,222	43,586*	75	75	
PNM	1,856,661	20,100	40	40	
MSI	1,580,395	39,319*	29	35	+ 6
PLI	815,681	35,143*	14	18	+ 4
PSDI	1,223,870	30,186	19	26	+ 7
PRI	437,889	24,663	5	9	+ 4
IS	225,410	41,754*	0	5	+ 5
UP	171,177	35,435*	0	4	+ 4
ADN	120,555	28,727	0	2	+ 2
PPST	122,810	30,298	3	3	

* Seat assigned on basis of remainder.

An entirely different result would have obtained if a plurality system had been applied to the Italian elections. It is of course difficult to draw up single-member constituencies where they do not exist in fact. If the thirty-one electoral districts had been used for this purpose, the Christian Democrats in 1953 would have won in all but three districts (XII, XIV, XVI). Adding the votes of the Socialists to those of the Communists would make the races close in many places, but would actually change the results in favor of the Left in only six more districts (I, III, VII, XIII, XV, XVIII). Or, if one were to make Italy's 91 provinces the basis of determining representation in the lower chamber, the Christian Democrats in 1953 would have had a plurality in all but fifteen of them. Of the latter, fourteen would have gone to the Communists and one to the Socialists.[32] Although the Christian Democrats are far and away the strongest single party in Italy, it would not be safe to draw conclusions about its strength under a plurality system unless the districts for electing the present 590 members of the Chamber were actually drawn and the votes within them analyzed.

---

[32] Because the official figures on the 1953 elections were not yet available at the time of writing, these statistics were taken from numerous Italian newspapers. Thus this conclusion may be slightly in error.

TABLE IX. RURAL-URBAN NATURE OF THE VOTE, 1948: PERCENTAGE PARTY VOTE ON BASIS OF SIZE OF COMMUNITIES
CHAMBER AND SENATE

	Communities (*By thousands of inhabitants*)																		Provincial Capitals		Other Places		Italy	
	0–1		1–3		3–5		5–10		10–30		30–100		100–250		250–500		Over 500							
	Ch.	Sen.	Ch.	Sen.	Ch.	Sen.	Ch.	Sen.	Ch.	Sen.	Ch.	Sen.	Ch.	Sen.	Ch.	Sen.	Ch.	Sen.	Ch.	Sen.	Ch.	Sen.	Ch.	Sen.
DC	57.9	55.6	55.1	54.1	52.6	52.6	49.9	50.1	46.1	45.4	44.4	44.0	41.8	41.0	45.1	40.2	46.3	47.0	45.0	44.3	49.9	—	48.5	48.0
PCI-PSI	20.3	20.1	23.6	23.7	27.9	27.9	31.3	31.2	34.7	34.2	33.9	32.9	37.6	37.6	29.4	28.8	31.5	31.9	32.0	31.7	30.6	—	31.0	30.9
PSDI	9.3	5.1	7.2	3.4	6.4	3.3	6.7	4.1	6.0	4.2	6.8	4.2	7.6	6.8	8.7	7.3	9.3	3.5	8.6	4.8	6.5	—	7.1	4.2
PRI-PSDI	—	3.0	—	2.7	—	2.5	—	2.1	—	1.5	—	2.6	—	1.3	—	1.7	—	6.6	—	4.1	—	—	—	2.7
PLI	3.2	5.5	4.2	6.6	4.1	6.1	4.0	5.6	4.2	5.6	3.7	5.8	4.6	7.0	4.2	2.6	2.1	2.9	3.3	4.5	4.1	—	3.8	5.4
PRI	0.8	0.8	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8	2.1	2.1	2.6	2.8	4.7	5.6	1.9	2.0	1.8	2.3	2.6	2.0	3.0	3.1	2.3	—	2.5	2.6
PNM	0.9	0.3	1.9	0.8	2.2	0.8	2.4	1.2	2.9	1.9	2.8	1.7	3.2	2.5	6.6	6.2	3.5	2.6	3.8	2.9	2.4	—	2.8	1.7
MSI	0.9	—	1.6	—	1.8	—	1.5	—	1.8	—	2.2	—	2.2	—	2.4	—	3.5	—	2.9	—	1.6	—	2.0	—
OTHERS	6.6	9.6	4.7	7.3	3.1	5.0	2.1	3.6	1.6	4.4	1.5	3.2	1.1	1.8	1.8	10.9	1.2	3.5	1.4	4.6	2.6	—	2.3	4.5

For example, there is strong reason for believing that the Christian Democrats would not carry as many districts in the urban areas as they would in the countryside. Table IX demonstrates that there are important differences between the urban and rural strength of the parties in Italy. Note particularly the striking contrast between the relative strength of the Christian Democrats and the Left in communities up to 5,000 inhabitants. It is in places such as these, which are legion in Italy, that the Christian Democrats draw the most from the electoral cooperation of prelates and the Catholic Action Civic Committees. Interesting too is the revelation that the strength of the Left is at its maximum in cities within the 100,000–250,000 group rather than in the largest metropolises and that, in general, its strength is evenly distributed in all categories. Although Table IX is based on the 1948 elections, it does not appear that the situation has been modified significantly in 1953. Whenever the opportunity to compare Christian Democratic strength in the province as contrasted to the provincial capital presented itself, it was found that the vote was consistently lower in the city. In fact, if any striking departures from the 1948 results are eventually revealed, they will doubtless occur in the rural areas where the Left has been concentrating its efforts in recent years.

IV

In conclusion, I should like briefly to consider the question whether P.R. is a logical and workable system for Italy. As far as the particular P.R. methods employed for each house of the Italian Parliament are concerned, the foregoing section demonstrated that both are mathematically equitable and give adequate representation to the major Italian political constellations. But those who are wary of P.R. might well point out that the recent elections substantiate the claim that P.R. encourages the formation of ungovernable legislatures. It is perfectly valid, for example, to conclude that the Christian Democrats will encounter major difficulties in the formation and maintenance of governments unless they are to make serious political concessions to either the Monarchists or the Socialists. To the extent that they are compelled or elect to deal exclusively with the minor Center parties, their ability to provide Italy with the internal order characteristic of the first postwar Parliament will be decreased.

Yet it would not be correct to suggest that P.R. is a cause of this situation. Multi-parties existed in the country before P.R. was introduced for the first time in 1919. The uninominal, majoritarian system which prevailed for most of the years from unification of the peninsula to 1919 did not result in a two-party society in the American or British sense. Immediately upon liberation of the country in 1945, six and not two major parties reappeared on the Italian political scene, and all were agreed that P.R. would provide the best means of reflecting the differences within the country.

In dealing with P.R., the emphasis should be placed on its tendency to *reflect* and not to *cause* whatever political atomization may exist. In a country such as Italy it is highly questionable whether the majoritarian system can be defended either ideologically or technically. The theory of representation which insists that the candidate elected represents *all* of the voters within his constituency would not be accepted by many of the Italian political parties, and assuredly by fewer of the electors themselves. Where, as in Italy, political issues are usually clear-cut, and radically divergent socio-economic views separate large segments of the population, the defeat of one's candidate is construed as meaning not only a lack of effective representation, but also that the opponent elected will do everything possible to act against the interests of the defeated group.

I would call this attitude more realistic than it is cynical. If some mythical concept often labelled the "general interest" does motivate Italian representatives, it would appear that this is true only when the myth does not seriously conflict with much more immediate and tangible interests. To the extent that this hypothesis is valid, I would say that P.R. operates as a critical escape valve rather than as an incentive to instability in Italy. One need not ponder for long the potential negative impact of a majoritarian system on Italian society. Those in Parliament might all be cut from the same political vine, but the unrepresented would not be pacified by glowing speeches on what is best for the national or general interest. More than anything else, elections by plurality would so distort the political complexion of the country as to leave the unrepresented minorities no alternative to seeking new and perhaps violent means of achieving expression.

It is significant that not even the ill-fated Scelba Law aimed at a complete destruction of P.R., the Christian Democrats having publicly admitted that a system similar to what Italy had prior to 1919 could not be considered logical for the country. The Scelba Law, which endeavoured to incorporate the advantages of both the P.R. and majoritarian approaches to representation, was an attempt to gloss over certain realities of Italian society which tended to be reflected in the realm of politics. For a society in which social equilibrium is basically stable, such a device might have merit. In Italy, however, it is quite probable that the legislation would have aggravated existing divisions. It would therefore have fallen short of the prerequisite of a sound representative system suggested by James Pollock and Alfred de Grazia—i.e., that the method of representation tend to harmonize the various competing and/or conflicting elements in society.

It seems to me that this prerequisite—which is fundamental—can best be met only if electoral systems are devised and evaluated not abstractly but in terms of the concrete facts and needs apparent in each society. The Italian version of P.R. would, in this sense, appear to satisfy this requirement better than any other which has been suggested.

I would add as a word of caution that stability for Italian institutions is not, in the final analysis, to be sought in the mechanics of electoral legislation but in the removal or modification of the conditions which have led to the armed peace which currently prevails among socio-political-economic groups of the society. Doubtless, the system of choosing representatives has bearing on this problem, and a presumption in favor of P.R. should exist so long as it can be demonstrated that P.R., more than any other method, facilitates social compromise in the legislature.

THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF ADMINISTRATION: THE FARMER COMMITTEE SYSTEM*

REED L. FRISCHKNECHT
University of Utah

The emergence in full flower, during the past twenty years, of the "positive state" has meant a great extension of administrative activity. This activity has been attacked as undemocratic by some persons whose concern was primarily with the programs carried out rather than with the means used to execute the programs. But the friends and even the originators of the programs have sometimes had an uncomfortable feeling that the traditional administrative mechanism has undemocratic tendencies. They have sought some means of democratizing the administrative process.

The most ambitious—indeed, the only thoroughgoing—attempt has been the use by the United States Department of Agriculture of the farmer committee system for the field service administration of agricultural price and income support programs, begun in 1933, and, since 1936, of the Agricultural Conservation Programs.[1] This farmer committee system comprises over 100,000 farmers elected or appointed to serve on approximately 48 state, 3,000 county, and 29,000 community committees. The champions of this system believe that it decentralizes administration, putting authority and responsibility in the hands of those immediately affected by the programs. Further, it supplies new vitality to administration by drawing the clientele into the administrative processes. These objectives have imposed a significant structural requirement upon decentralized administration—the use of the committee system, a plural executive, in preference to a single administrator.

The major units comprising the national administrative agency's[2] field service have always been the state and county offices under the direction of appointed state and elected county farmer committees. Regional field offices in the role of "filtering plants" or coordinating units for program operations between the national administrative agency and the forty-eight state field offices have never been maintained. However, control and coordination of these offices for general program administration have been effectuated, since 1936, by dividing the country into regions or areas under the supervision of regional or area directors in the Washington office.

---

* The author makes acknowledgment to the Research Committee of the University of Utah for assistance in the preparation of this study.

[1] For a description and analysis of these programs, see Reed L. Frischknecht, *Farm Price and Income Support Programs, 1933–1950,* Research Monograph Series: Number One, Institute of Government, University of Utah (Salt Lake City, 1953).

[2] Herein the phrase "national administrative agency" refers to the agency responsible for the execution of the price and income support programs and Agricultural Conservation Programs, that is, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, 1933–1942; the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, 1942–1945; and the Production and Marketing Administration, 1945 to the present.

The farmer committee system has been pronounced a great success. Secretary Brannan called it "the most representative, efficient and democratic mechanism that has ever been developed for the administration of farm programs"[3]; the national administrative agency has called it "the strong backbone of . . . operations in the field"[4]; and a leading scholar in agricultural administration has said that "the farmer administrators of the program are members of an administrative organization which creates its *esprit de corps* out of its services to the farmers in pursuit of justice."[5] Farmers also have applauded the plan.[6] If this testimony is accurate, practical decisions are taken at the state and local levels in a democratic way by groups of farmers who directly represent active and interested constituencies.

Yet the teachings of public administration would cause one to anticipate quite different results. Is it feasible to decentralize administrative control over a program which by its nature requires national uniformity? Is it possible to engender active interest in administration on the part of the citizens affected? Can a plural executive effectively carry on day-to-day administration? After twenty years of experience with the farmer committee system, it is possible to supply provisional answers to these questions.

I

This field service composed of state, county, and community farmer administrative committees had its origin in the 1932 pre-election pronouncements of the Democratic party (later developed into a concrete organizational structure), and in the exigencies of the time.

In his Topeka address of September 14, 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt announced that the new farm program would be decentralized and would make use of existing organizations as far as possible in order to avoid the development of a large bureaucracy in Washington. This promise was elaborated into a concept of "agricultural democracy" by Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace, M. L. Wilson, then a professor at Montana State College, and Chester C. Davis, later the Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, with the assistance of certain outside advisors.[7]

---

[3] Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, "Democracy Must Go Forward: Address, PMA Annual Conference, 1950" (Washington: Office of the Secretary, Mimeographed, 1950), p. 16.

[4] Production and Marketing Administration, *Report of the Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration 1947* (Washington, 1948), p. 8.

[5] Charles M. Hardin, "The Politics of Agriculture in the United States," *Journal of Farm Economics*, Vol. 32, pp. 541–83 (Nov., 1950), at p. 573.

[6] See *Reorganization of the Department of Agriculture*, Hearings before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 82d Cong., 1st sess., on S. Bill 1149, August 28, 1951 (1951), p. 463, where one farmer said: "The abolition of this committee system . . . would deal a crippling blow to the effective administration of our farm programs."

[7] Letter from Henry A. Wallace, April 5, 1952: "My recollection is that M. L. Wilson, Chester Davis, and myself worked out the 'farmer committee system.' I was very proud of this because I looked on these committees as more nearly democracy in action, meeting

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 said little about administration, although it did authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use state and local committees at his discretion for field administration. The problem of establishing an administrative organization capable of putting the program into operation was pressing, for the act passed on May 12, 1933, and crop plantings were already in advanced stages. The only organization at hand adequate to the task was the Federal-State Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service, which had county agents in more than two-thirds of the counties in the United States. This agency was pressed into service and it remained, in most states, the nucleus of the field service until 1942.

A variety of state committee organizations was employed under the Agricultural Adjustment Act during the period 1933–36. At the one extreme the director of the state extension service, as the state administrator, often appointed a separate state advisory committee of farmers to help him administer the program for each basic crop for which a program was operative in that state.[8] At the other extreme the Secretary of Agriculture appointed the state director of extension, who would serve as chairman of the several committees, and appointed also the farmer members of a distinct committee for each of the several basic crops for which programs were in effect in the state. This complex system of state committees confused the farmer administrators, many of whom served on more than one committee, and also confused the farmers, who were required to sign a separate contract for each commodity on which they agreed to reduce production under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933.

---

a national problem at the local level, than anything in the entire national set-up." See also Russell Lord, *The Agrarian Revival* (New York, 1939), p. 147: "[Critics] . . . liked the contract feature but . . . [were] not sure the plan could be made democratic with the control decentralized and with the workers, for the most part, unpaid. Wilson persuaded . . . [many] that it could be done, and . . . formed a small supporting committee—Henry A. Wallace of Iowa; Louis Clark of Nebraska, a mortgage broker; W. R. Ronald, a small city newspaperman; and R. R. Rogers of New Jersey, a life insurance man. This committee worked without funds or pay." See also Donald C. Blaisdell, *Government and Agriculture* (New York, 1940), pp. 166–67: "Among the striking features of the farm program is the marked extent to which farmers and their representatives have become working parts of its operating mechanism. In large measure this development reflects the democratic philosophy of former Secretary Wallace and of former Undersecretary M. L. Wilson. . . . Mr. Wilson has shown unusual inventiveness. Farmer associations for administering agricultural adjustment . . . are all based on ideas originally conceived by Mr. Wilson.

"Probably no body of legislation comparable in scope to the farm program goes further in providing effective tools of economic self-government."

[8] Gladys Baker, *The County Agent* (Chicago, 1939), p. 94: "The southern state extension leaders . . . were generally more willing to assume a position of substantial responsibility in their programs than extension leaders in other states." See also Lord, *The Agrarian Revival*, p. 162: "Field action suggestions and orders were wired from Washington to the state directors of extension, partly as a test. Amid the ensuing flareback a circular letter, bluntly drawn, was sent to the governors of the states. It told what was proposed for the alleviation of agricultural distress there, and added that the extension service would probably lead the program in each state; but, if not, a separate state AAA field setup would have to be considered."

The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 contemplated a system that was never put into effect. The program was to be state-administered with the support of grants-in-aid awarded to states which submitted plans which met the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. The act required that the state agency be approved by the Secretary and that it employ county and community committees of elected farmers. No such plan was ever approved by the Secretary, although Congress, six months after the act's passage, clearly anticipating such action, extended only until 1942 the Secretary's authority to administer the program as he saw fit.[9]

The act provided that in the meantime the Secretary of Agriculture might provide for its administration through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The Secretary under this interim authority established in each state a State Soil Conservation Committee composed of five farmer members, with the director of the state agricultural extension service also generally a member. The appropriate regional director (located in Washington) of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration designated the chairman of the committee.

Two general patterns of operation were followed by state committees throughout the United States. The board-agent formula was the standard set-up adopted in the North Central Region; the state committee functioned as the policy-determining board with the chairman serving as the state executive officer. He had direct charge of and responsibility for the administration of all programs operative in his state under policies set up by the state committee, within the regulations established by the regional directors. In the other four regions, the state committee served merely as an advisory body to a state executive officer appointed by and responsible to the appropriate regional director for program administration in his state.

Under this administrative arrangement, the state extension service directors and their staffs played varied roles. In most states they retained full responsibility only for the educational phases of the programs. In many states outside the North Central Region, the director of extension remained as chairman. As such, he still carried most of the administrative responsibility, in many cases by sheer domination of other committee members, in other cases from absolute necessity if the job was to be done. In the remainder, including the North Central Region, the state director of extension served only as a committee member, the chairman being appointed from among the farmer members of the committee.

There were two principal reasons for this more restricted role of extension: (1) the interference with traditional extension activities created a desire on the part of many directors to relinquish responsibility for the administration of these programs which they had assumed in an emergency[10]; and (2) the Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration found it necessary to maintain clear-cut lines of authority and responsibility for the administration of a national program, a program not susceptible of being administered by grants-in-aid.[11]

---

[9] *Public Law 170*, 75th Cong., June 28, 1937. Several state plans were proposed but all were disapproved by the Secretary. Proposals have recently been made for making grants-in-aid to the states for carrying out the Class II or soil building practices under the Agricultural Conservation Programs. See *Agricultural Act of 1948*, Hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, 80th Cong., 2d sess. on S. Bill 2318, April 12–14, 1948 (1948), pp. 1–468. Since these hearings, one state plan has been proposed for administering the Agricultural Conservation Program in Mississippi. (Letter from Clay Lyle, Director, Mississippi State Agricultural Experiment Station and Extension Service, Jan. 3, 1953.)

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 gave a statutory basis to the state committee system adopted under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. It directed the Secretary to establish in each state a farmer committee of three to five members, with the director of the extension service serving as *ex officio* member. The chairman is now a farmer member of the committee. Since 1938 most state committees have attempted to assume collective responsibility for administration. In many states the committee has functioned like a commission, with each member actually administering a single phase of program operations but with collective responsibility in the whole committee for the totality of program operations.

The next level of administrative organization has been the county. Two major considerations dictated its choice as the basic unit for local administration. First, the county was a familiar political unit; second, the county agricultural agents, who played such an important role in the initial administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, were organized on that basis.[12]

The first step in organization involved the holding of educational meetings by the county agricultural agent, assisted by a temporary county educational campaign committee, in each of some 2,500 rural counties in the United States. This emergency activity of thoroughly acquainting farmers with the various production adjustment programs, in addition to the work involved in organizing community and county production control associations, occupied most of the time of state extension services during 1934–35.[13] After the educational meetings, the directors of state extension services or the state committees appointed temporary county committees for the purpose of conducting elections for permanent community committeemen.

---

[10] *General Farm Legislation,* Hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, 75th Cong., 2d sess., on S. R. 158, October 4, 1937, Part II (1937), p. 1919.

[11] The real core of the problem at that time has been ably described as follows: " 'Give us the money; we'll run our own program. We know this part of the country and these people. You don't.' This, as ever, was the cry of the state leaders.

"And Washington, retorting: 'Do you as a state leader put a man in a county, hand him public funds, and simply turn him loose? You don't. And we can't, and won't, take responsibility for the dispersal of all this federal money without a degree of authority as to programs and methods.'

"Lawyers examining the Smith-Lever Act (1914) in Washington found that it gave the Secretary of Agriculture no real authority over the state and county extension forces. Specialists in organization, examining the betangled wildwood of Departmental organization charts, threw up their hands. They called for a New Deal as to organization within the Department." (Lord, *The Agrarian Revival,* p. 163.)

[12] John D. Lewis, "Democratic Planning in Agriculture," this REVIEW, Vol. 35, p. 232–49 (April, 1941), at p. 240.

[13] Federal Extension Service, *Serving American Agriculture, A Report of Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics in 1933,* p. 5: "County Agents devoted a total of 191,346 days to the promotion of the various emergency campaigns." See also Lord,

Each producer of a basic commodity was required to execute an application for membership, in the form of a contract to limit his planted acreage or production for the years 1933–35, in a county production-control association.[14] These production-control associations, one of which was established in each county for every basic commodity for which a program was operative[15] in that county, were the basic administrative units. Thus a farmer might belong, as thousands did, to county wheat, corn-hog, sugar beet, and other production-control associations all at the same time. It was not intended that such associations should replace any farm organization or usurp their functions; they were created for one purpose only—to administer the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 in their counties.

The formal internal organization of each production-control association consisted of five offices. First, the general governing body of the association was its board of directors, composed of the chairmen of the several community committees in the county. At its annual meeting this board elected from among its membership a president and a secretary—the latter usually the county agricultural agent of the extension service—and also a treasurer, who was not required to be a board member. It also elected from its membership a county allotment committee of three members; the president of the association was *ex officio* a member and chairman of this committee.

A district production-control association which included several counties was established when the production of the particular basic commodity was not sufficient in those counties to warrant setting up separate county associations, and also in those cases where counties did not have county agricultural agents. Each county in the district association was considered to be a community, or, if it embraced a large area, several communities. The formal organization of the district association was the same as that of the county association.

As early as 1934, particularly in diversified crop areas, farmers complained

---

The Agrarian Revival, p. 171: "After great adjustment drives in one-crop areas, as many as six or a dozen members of a state extension staff will be temporarily incapacitated by physical and nervous exhaustion. Kansas sent four men to the hospital after the initial drive for wheat reduction in 1934." William Peterson, Director, Utah State Agricultural Extension Service, reported: "One of the weaknesses of the Extension work in Utah is that the staff, in general, has been driven so hard with the multiplicity of duties, that many are just at the breaking point. . . . The personnel of the Service has been crowded and driven in a greater urgency than in any other period within my experience." "Annual Report of Director of Extension, Utah 1935," typewritten (Logan, 1935), p. 9.

[14] For example, see Wheat Section, Production Division, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, *Articles of Association of the Wheat Production Control Association* (Washington, 1933), p. 1.

[15] During the period 1933–34, there were 4,706 production-control associations in operation for the wheat, cotton, corn-hog, and tobacco adjustment programs. See "Summary of the 1934 Agricultural Adjustment Program," *Extension Service Review*, Vol. 6, p. 15 (Jan.–Feb., 1935).

about the number of production-control associations in a single county. The principal complaint was that the administrative cost of maintaining so many different production-control associations was excessive. After the decision of the Supreme Court invalidating the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933,[16] and subsequent passage of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act in 1936,[17] the various commodity adjustment programs were replaced by a single program—the Agricultural Conservation Program—open to all farmers. The production-control associations were dissolved, and were replaced, by administrative action of the Secretary of Agriculture, with a single agricultural conservation association in each county.

Farmers participating in the Agricultural Conservation Program were automatically members of the new association in their respective counties. In 1936, over 2,700 county agricultural conservation associations replaced the more than 4,000 county and district production-control associations. These new county administrative units were formed under Articles of Association approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, since no state plan for administering the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 had been approved by the Secretary of Agriculture as the Congress had intended.

The organizational structure of the county agricultural conservation association was very similar to that of its predecessor, the county production-control association. Chairmen of the community committees constituted the board of directors. This board elected all officers of the association, including a president and vice-president, who had to be board members, and a county executive committee.[18] The county executive committee, composed of the president, the vice-president, and one other board member, was charged with the county administration of price and income support programs as well as of the Agricultural Conservation Program.[19]

During this period the responsibilities of the state extension services and their county agricultural agents were twofold. Their first efforts were educational in nature. In 1937 county agents spent about one-fourth of their time in acquainting farmers with the Agricultural Conservation Programs. Their second major responsibility was that of directing the administration of the Agricultural Conservation Program by the county executive committee, or "county committee," as the farmers called it. In both respects, and for much the same reasons, extension activity varied considerably throughout the United States under this administrative arrangement.

---

[16] *United States* v. *Butler*, 297 U.S. 1 (1936).

[17] *Public Law 461*, 74th Cong., Feb. 29, 1936.

[18] In the Southern states, the county agricultural agent served as secretary, a member of his staff as treasurer. In other regions, the county agent was usually elected secretary by the board of directors. See Agricultural Adjustment Administration, *Agricultural Conservation 1936, A Report of the Activities of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration* (Washington, 1936), p. 60.

[19] In the Northeast Region, the third member did not have to be a board member; in the North Central Region, the county agent served *ex officio* as a committee member without vote.

With the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the county committee system acquired a specific statutory basis. The act specified the composition and structure of the county committee and directed that it be used for local administration of price and income support programs and the Agricultural Conservation Program. Actually, the act merely gave statutory effect to the use made of this device for administrative purposes since 1933 under the broad provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936.

The act provided for a county agricultural conservation committee of three members, who had to be farmers, and a secretary. In September, 1949, effective with the 1950 elections, Secretary Brannan, acting under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 as amended by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, provided for the expansion of the committee to consist of a chairman, a vice-chairman, a third regular member, and first and second alternates who should serve as acting or regular members, in the order elected, under specified conditions.[20] On that occasion also the name of the county agricultural conservation committee was changed to production and marketing administration county committee.

Since 1938 county committee members have been indirectly elected at a county convention for a year's term, with no limit upon the number of terms. Delegates to this convention, one from each community administrative area, are elected directly at the time of the annual election of community committeemen.

The lowest level of administrative organization is the community. When the Triple-A was launched in 1933, the county agricultural agent or a temporary county committee of farmers districted each rural county into administrative areas called communities. Distinct systems of communities were established for each production-adjustment program operative in the county. The number of communities depended upon the size of the county, the number of producers of the commodity concerned, and the county's acreage or production record in the particular commodity. Geographical considerations and political boundaries such as those of voting districts or precincts were taken into account in fixing the boundaries.

The temporary county committee or the county agent established temporary community campaign committees of three or more members by direct appointment. These temporary community committees helped conduct educational meetings and the preliminary contract sign-up campaigns in their respective communities or administrative areas. Upon the completion of the educational and sign-up campaigns, those producers who signed contracts, and thereby became eligible voting members of the county production-control association for the commodity in question, elected permanent community committees. Each community committee consisted of from three to five members. The chairman of each committee represented the community as a member of the board of directors of the county production-control association.[21]

---

[20] Production and Marketing Administration, *Regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture Governing PMA County and Community Committees 1949* (Washington, 1949), p. 1.

In most cases the temporary committeemen were elected to the permanent community committee. The separate adjustment program for each commodity made for a multitude of local committees. Often a farmer was a member of four or more community committees—one for each commodity for which a program was operative in his county and under which he had signed a contract. Cooperating farmers also voted in as many community elections as they had signed separate commodity adjustment contracts. Since administrative expenses were deducted from growers' benefit payments, agitation for a simplified structural organization soon developed. Most important, from an administrative point of view, was the fact that this situation stretched the county agent's or county committee's "span of control" to the point where adequate administrative supervision was impossible.

With the passage of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936, and the creation of a single county agricultural conservation association, each county was districted into new community administrative areas. Once again a temporary county agricultural conservation committee was appointed in each county, and with the county agent's help conducted educational meetings. These were followed by the election of permanent community committees consisting of a chairman, two members, and an alternate committeeman.[22] The cooperating farmer was now a member of only one committee, eligible to vote in a single community election and to hold a position on the community committee if elected.

Two years later the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which provided for an enlarged farm program, made mandatory the use of community committees.[23] During the years 1936–38 these administrative units had been authorized by law, but the statute left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture the extent of their use. Since the 1938 Agricultural Conservation Program was already in effect when the Act of 1938 became law and committeemen for that year had already been elected, the community committees established under the authority of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936 functioned through that year.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 provided that no community administrative area could include more than one county, or parts of different counties.[24] The farmers in such an administrative area, and participating in the various programs administered in the area, are eligible to vote in the direct election of community committeemen and of a delegate to the annual county convention for the purpose of electing the county committee.[25] During the past fourteen years such committees have existed in most counties in the United States.[26]

---

[21] Agricultural Adjustment Administration, *Agricultural Adjustment, A Report of Administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act May, 1933, to February, 1934*, p. 135.

[22] Agricultural Adjustment Administration, *Agricultural Conservation 1936* (cited in n. 18), p. 59.

[23] *Public Law 430*, 75th Cong., Feb. 16, 1938. See Section 388 (a): "The provisions of section 8(b) and section 11 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, relating to the utilization of . . . local committees . . . shall apply in the administration of this Act; and the Secretary shall, for such purposes, utilize the same local . . . committees. . . . "

[24] *Public Law 430*, 75th Cong., Feb. 16, 1938, Section 101(b). However, unique arrangements were made between state committees for the administration of programs in

From 1938 to 1950 the community committee was composed of three members. Effective with the 1950 elections, committee membership was expanded to include first and second alternates, who serve as committee members in case of the temporary absence of a member or in the case of the death, resignation, removal, or disqualification of a regular member.[27]

II

In spite of the numerous official commendations of the farmer committee system, these committees have not in fact operated efficiently: indeed, there are many cases in which they cannot be said in any real sense to have operated at all.

The state committees have demonstrated the weaknesses of the plural executive in administration, and have developed other weaknesses of their own. Of necessity, committees meet infrequently, and cannot carry on the day-to-day administration for which they are responsible. Individual state committeemen charged with supervision of particular programs often give direct orders to state office personnel. This factor alone has made for much confusion and the lack of "unity of command," because the office personnel look to the state executive officer for direction but he has no final authority and cannot always establish firm priorities for work completion. In addition, it is regrettably true that most committeemen are not trained to discharge responsibilities in management and administration.[28] Committeemen have demonstrated sincerity, earnestness, and integrity, but these qualities are not enough.

---

inaccessible areas. For example, see Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, July 9, 1942," typewritten (Logan: State Office, 1942), p. 3: "The ACP supervision work of the Goshute Indian Reservation in Juab County, Utah, has been handled up to date by Nevada through the White Pine County Office. . . . It was the decision of the Utah State Committee that inasmuch as they are willing to continue the work, it should be handled from there." See also Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, March 18, 1942," typewritten (Logan: State Office, 1942), p. 3: "The Executive Assistant read a letter from Summit County requesting approval of the State Committee for the transfer of farms and ranches in the Lone Tree area in Summit County to Sweetwater County, Wyoming, in order to facilitate supervision. This letter was written upon request of the farmers and ranchers. An explanation was given that it would be more economical to supervise this area from Wyoming than from Utah."

[25] *Public Law 430*, 75th Cong., Feb. 16, 1938, Section 101(b). See also the *Regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture* cited in n. 20, p. 1.

[26] In the sparsely settled, or mainly urban, counties, community committees are not utilized. For example, Nevada has no community committees. See *Reorganization of the Department of Agriculture*, Senate Hearings, August 28, 1951, p. 420.

[27] *Regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture*, cited in n. 20.

[28] This fact is certainly implied in former Secretary Anderson's response to repeated questions from members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as to why the national administrative agency had not utilized state committees more and in the

Evidence on such a topic must be anecdotal. The following examples are solely from Utah, but experienced agricultural administrators have agreed that they are representative. In 1942 a member of the Utah state committee noted that the committeemen "have handled only the emergency work that had to be done and have given very little thought to the entire job."[29] Three years later the state committee was called to account by the Director of the Western Region of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency because the state had not completed its 1944 program operations; it "had no definite explanation to give Washington."[30] The Director had had this experience before:

> Speaking of delinquent states, Director Geissler said that he had never seen a change in the status of work where either county or state committees got too far behind. . . . He thought that there was need for more definite and quick action.[31]

These episodes are representative of the experience in many states, and well illustrate a major defect inherent in administration by plural executive bodies —the lack of a definite center of responsibility.

Fortunately the difficulties to which administration by committees gives rise have led to the practical abdication of this function by the committees. In most states the state executive officer has assumed the responsibility for making decisions on daily program operations in areas of both administration and program policy. This has been necessary in order to maintain unity of command within the state office and clear lines of authority and responsibility between the national administrative agency and the field service. In states where this has not occurred, the executive officer functions as the agent of the state committee, which determines administrative policy and is collectively responsible for administration but has delegated the responsibility for day-to-day operations to the executive officer.

The actual functioning of administration at the county level was determined, during the period 1933–42, not by the formal regulations issued by the national administrative agency, but rather by other factors. The most important of these was the policy adopted by the directors of individual state extension services. In a few states this policy was one which considered the county agent as a staff advisor to the county committee. In this case the county committees were the important administrative agencies in fact as well as in theory. In most states, however, the prevailing attitude and adopted policy was that actual administrative control should be exercised directly by the county agent. In part this is attributable to the desire of state extension service directors to dominate

---

manner some witnesses claimed they did: "As we in the Department have indicated on many occasions, we favor giving State Committees as much authority and responsibility as may be practicable and feasible in carrying out the . . . programs." See *Agricultural Act of 1948* (Senate hearings cited in n. 9), p. 40.

[29] Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, July 9, 1942," typewritten (Logan: State Office, 1942), p. 3.

[30] Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, July 20, 1945 " typewritten (Logan: State Office, 1945), p. 1.

[31] *Ibid.*

all governmental contacts with the farmers. However, there were sound reasons as well. Farmer administrative experience was almost non-existent. The county agent, on the other hand, not only was generally respected and trusted by farmers but also was capable of directing the execution of the necessary "paper work" involved. Moreover, the administrative cost of the programs was an important consideration. At the county level, administrative expenses were deducted from benefit payments the farmers received. The more the administrative work was assumed by the county agent and his office staff, the smaller were the expenses of the county association. During these years the office of the county agent was in fact the office of the county committee, which paid a portion of the expense involved.

In 1942, however, there came a sharp break. The national administrative agency desired to place full responsibility upon county committeemen, since it could not maintain clear lines of authority and responsibility without control over the county agents. The extension service directors, on the other hand, wished to retain control of the county agents, and they saw them falling under the influence of the national administrative agency.[32] In addition, many directors desired to return to their traditional educational and demonstrational work. Since 1942, therefore, the agents have in general served merely as *ex officio* committee members.

How have county committees operated since this divorcement? What does the record indicate about the efficiency of county committees? Where committees have attempted to carry on the work themselves, the result has been delay and confusion. In 1945 the Utah state committee inquired into administration in one county:

> Messrs. Hopkins and Larsen [members of state committee] stated that few meetings were held in the county and that committee action was not taken on any of the problems that arose. They stated that Mr. ———— [member of county committee] would come into the office and outline things as he wanted them and generally upset the routine of work already being followed. . . . Mr. George [member of state committee] said that the county office force did not like to have Mr. ———— come to the office because he confused them on procedure and generally disrupted their work. . . .[33]

---

[32] William Peterson, former director of the Utah State Agricultural Extension Service, said in an interview on August 20, 1951: "The people from Washington wanted to take over the county agents to administer the Act; I would not stand for that. Beginning then [1942] the county agent had little to do with administration, but did carry on some educational work."

[33] Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, July 20, 1945," typewritten (Salt Lake City: State Office, 1945), pp. 1–4. Conditions in this county at that time are revealed by the following comment: "Mr. Allred [State Executive Officer] reported to the committee the results of the visit . . . at ———— County. He explained that approximately 300, 1944 applications for payment had been prepared in the office prior to the visit, [and that] County personnel were having difficulty in completing the work because of lack of organization. He explained that . . . instructions were given for completing the applications. He said that a schedule of work had been set up and assignments made to the County personnel for completing the work." Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, April 5, 1945," typewritten (Salt Lake City: State Office, 1945), pp. 1–2.

The chairman of the county committee replied:

> . . . that he still understood that it was the whole committee's responsibility to see that a job was done. Mr. Lee [chairman, State Committee] said that the State Committee held the chairman of the County committee responsible to see that other members of the County committee carried out assignments made to them. E. H. Anderson, member of the County committee, explained that he did not know the condition that compliance and application work [delegated to a member of the County committee] was in until it was too late.[34]

The same problem arose again in 1949:

> Mr. Coombs [state farmer fieldman] reported that work was not progressing too satisfactorily in ———— County and that Mr. ————, Chairman, was having some difficulty in keeping things moving. . . . He reported [also] that they were not getting much accomplished in ———— County because the County Committee was too busy on their own farm work to devote time to the job.[35]

Unfortunately these are not isolated instances, but are fair examples of the operation of an administrative body which structurally defies the fundamental rules of public administration.

It was necessary to fill the void left by the withdrawal of the county agent. In general this has been done by the employment of full-time office managers and clerical help. The Department of Agriculture has been reluctant to admit that this development has occurred. However, Mr. Gus F. Geissler, PMA Administrator 1951–53, conceded it:

> *Mr. Geissler:* We use the term "State and county committees" all the time. But that does not mean that part-time county committeemen actually are doing the job. They have the over-all, general responsibility, but, as you know, they have full-time employees in their county offices and we have full-time employees in our State offices.
>
> The folks that are actually inspecting these bin sites and doing the work on the policy laid down by the State Committee are generally full-time employees. That is true in county offices, too.
>
> *Mr. Whitten* [Democratic Representative, Mississippi]: In other words, it is under the supervision of the county committee.
>
> *Mr. Geissler:* We probably say county officer or state officer, but we just follow the terminology whereby we say state and county committee. But it does not mean they actually do all this work themselves.[36]

Departmental spokesmen are not usually so candid on this matter of county committee administration. On another occasion, Administrator Geissler testified:

> *Mr. Geissler:* I think a great deal of misunderstanding arises in the failure to recognize that these folks perform administrative work. And when you take the three county committeemen which averages about $1,200 per county, and add to that the 30 community

---

[34] Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, August 1, 1945," typewritten (Salt Lake City: State Office, 1945), pp. 2–3.

[35] Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, September 8, 1949," typewritten (Salt Lake City: State Office, 1949), p. 3.

[36] *Warehousing Practices, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture,* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the House Committee on Appropriations, 82d Cong., 2nd sess., Jan. 4, 1952 (Washington, 1952), p. 256.

> committeemen in the average county with an average of about $50, it would be less than the equivalent of one constant administrative person that you could hire in a county office for a year. . . .[37]

This gives a false impression. The evidence is in the budget. During the fiscal year 1950–51, the salaries of county committeemen were given by the Department of Agriculture as $3,786,588.[38] During the same year, 3,128 full-time county office personnel were paid $11,621,275.[39] In fact, therefore, the actual cost of county administrative services during this fiscal year was $15,407,863, not $3,768,588. The minutes of state committee meetings also show the reliance that is placed on the full-time employees. Within a few months after the county agents were removed from administrative responsibility, county committees flooded state committees with requests for permission to hire county office managers.[40] Of the several reasons advanced by a state AAA committee for failure to complete its 1943 and 1944 wartime program operations on time, two of the most important listed were rapid turnover of county office personnel, and the limited number of employees.[41]

Consequently we have a dual set of officials. One set is the county committee, legally responsible and highly praised as democratic and efficient, but doing little of the administrative work. The other is an office force (headed by a county office manager who is poorly paid and ignored) which does the actual work. This is not the result sought by the originators of the farmer committee system, but it was implicit in the structure.

Seven years after the initiation of the first acreage-adjustment program, a spokesman for the Department of Agriculture observed that it is ridiculous "to assume that such involved administrative work can be carried on indefinitely by relying solely on the native sense of these committeemen," and that such a view "was counter . . . to the best judgment of those who realize the complexities of the problem."[42] Shortly thereafter, the Department set up "schools of philosophy" for farmers to equip them for administration. However, little improvement in committee administration followed. More recently the Department has merely shut its eyes to the problem. A former vice-president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Earl Smith, however, is willing to throw in the sponge:

---

[37] *Reorganization of the Department of Agriculture* (Senate hearings cited in n. 6), pp. 334–35.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 420.

[39] *Department of Agriculture Appropriations for 1952*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the House Committee on Appropriations, 82d Cong., 1st sess., Part I, Feb., 1951 (Washington, 1951), p. 599.

[40] Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, November 10, 1943," typewritten (Logan: State Office, 1943), p. 3; Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, May 3, 1944," typewritten (Logan: State Office, 1944), p. 3; and Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, June 29, 1944," typewritten (Logan: State Office, 1944), p. 3.

[41] Utah State AAA Committee, "Minutes of State Committee Meeting, April 25, 1944," typewritten (Logan: State Office, 1944), p. 5.

[42] Carl Taeusch, "Schools of Philosophy," in *Yearbook of Agriculture 1940*, ed. Gove Hambidge (Washington, 1940), p. 1122.

> I will be very frank in saying that . . . I think at the county level the so-called county administrators, elected by farmers should move by statute into a position of what a directorate is to business institutions, rather than administrators.
>
> I don't believe by popular election you can select men peculiarly qualified in the matter of mathematics and so forth to carry out this act.[43]

It should be realized that mere decentralization of governmental operations and public participation in the administrative processes do not guarantee better administration.[44]

There remain the community committeemen. Their administrative duties vary from year to year and from program to program. For example, when acreage allotments are in effect, committeemen are generally assigned to the job of compliance determination; when commodity loan programs are operative, committeemen make inspections of stored commodities; and they serve as crop insurance salesmen for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

The number of community committeemen has averaged, during the years 1933–52, approximately 90,000. They have served on about 29,000 community committees in over 3,000 counties.[45] Their tenure has been somewhat less stable than that of county committeemen. This fact, however, has not been due to any increase in farmer participation in annual elections, or a desire on the part of farmers to seek election to committee membership. The rather high turnover is attributed by committee members to inadequate compensation and the failure of the county committee to establish a definite policy with regard to utilization of community committeemen. The average community committeeman has worked approximately 7.7 days annually, for which he has received an average per diem salary of $5.37. The average annual salary for the period 1933–52 was $41.34.[46] As to the indecision of the county committee, one complaint ran in these terms:

> Community committeemen need to be taken into the county committee's confidence. Our committee came to the only county meeting called last year. We couldn't help much in one meeting. We don't know what the county's policy is, but general policy meetings should be called so that the community committees and the county committee can establish one. There's no sense in having so-called community committeemen if they're never used during the year, except to reelect a county committee whose activities they don't know much about. It's pure nonsense the way it works now, and farmers are tired of it.[47]

---

[43] *Long-Range Agricultural Policy and Program*, Hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, 80th Cong., 1st sess., on S. R. 147, Part II, Oct. 20, 1947 (Washington, 1947), p. 360.

[44] One scholar has observed that "the beginning and the end of wisdom in the development of democratic theory [in administration] may lie in the recognition of inevitable limitations of the human material." See Dwight Waldo, "Development of Theory of Democratic Administration," this REVIEW, Vol. 46, pp. 81–103 (March, 1952), at p. 99.

[45] Data derived from an analysis of the Annual Reports of the national administrative agency, 1933–52.

[46] *Ibid.*

[47] Statement made by a delegate to the Cache County, Utah, Election Convention, Dec. 8, 1950.

In response to such criticism, the Utah state committee has directed its county committees to develop an affirmative policy:

> We must bring community committeemen into a strong position in our administration. . . . It must become the established attitude of all County Committeemen that they desire to share their own decisions on program policies with their community committeemen. It is the most effective way in which the County Committee can stay in close contact with the thinking of all farmers in the county and be in the best position to contribute the most to the development of practicable and effective programs.[48]

Except for their role in electing annually the county committeemen, community committeemen, in general, have not performed, on a continuous basis, other significant activities. For all intent and purpose, they have served a few days a year as the paid employees of the county office. In this capacity, they have performed various activities when found qualified to do so; when not so qualified, county offices have been disposed to hire other personnel to perform these activities. This latter situation is by no means infrequent.

III

Despite what was said above, the farmer committee system has not been an insignificant excresence on line operations. It has developed an unexpected character and significance—a character and significance unintended by its framers and indeed in marked contrast with their intentions. At the state and county level, there has emerged a "hard core" of professional farmer committeemen who dominate the system. These professionals, although their importance in administration has been slight, have played a highly significant political role. These developments have in part been the consequence of the passivity of the farmer clientele; in part, they have resulted from a deliberate policy of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The hard core of professional farmer committeemen has developed as a result of the method of election relied upon, and the lack of extensive farmer participation in annual community elections. Departmental spokesmen have made much of the fact that price and income support programs as well as the Agricultural Conservation Program are administered by elected farmer committees. It is true that both county and community committeemen are elected, but there are important differences. Direct elections are held for community committeemen, but never for county committeemen; yet the implication of Department officials has been that all committeemen are directly elected by those farmers eligible to participate in annual elections. The facts are these: (1) from 1933 to 1936 county committeemen were chosen by the boards of directors of the county production-control associations, and from 1936 to 1938 by the boards of directors of the county agricultural conservation associations; (2) from 1938 to date they have been chosen at an annual county convention, by delegates elected at community elections. In addition, administrative rulings to the effect that delegates to the county convention may not be elected members of county committees have eliminated a possible source of farmer leadership and administrative ability, since community committeemen have generally been delegates to the county conventions.

---

[48] Utah State PMA Committee, "Importance of Community Committeemen in PMA Activities," mimeographed (Salt Lake City: State Office, 1951), p. 1.

Participation in community elections was relatively good during the first year or two after the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, although not all that might have been expected.[49] By 1940, participation not only had not improved but had actually declined in most states. A survey of twelve representative counties in 1941 by the Department of Agriculture indicated that participation was "very slight" and that "only 25 percent of those eligible to vote in the twelve counties actually did vote."[50] The situation had become so bad by 1947 that farm organizations themselves took a hand in bringing the facts before Congress. The National Farmers Union at its 40th Annual Convention in 1946 adopted a resolution recommending that elections be void unless at least 50 per cent of the eligible farmers in the community voted.[51] In an appearance before the House Committee on Agriculture, Albert Goss, then Grand Master of the National Grange, observed that "just a few vote. Many times 15 or 20 vote or even 10. . . . Those elections out in the townships [communities] just don't express the sentiments of the farmers."[52] More recently, official spokesmen of the national administrative agency have also recognized the situation, although nothing of a concrete nature has been done to excite more interest among farmers.[53]

---

[49] A former state executive officer recently told this writer that "participation was fairly good during the early years. Even good crowds of between 20 and 40 came out. Most of them, however, were not too interested in elections but came out to make sure that nothing happened to decrease their acreage allotments. Sometimes the payment checks were held until election time and given to the farmers at the election meetings, but most farmers came and got their checks and then left. This scheme to get more farmers out to elections didn't work very well. If ten came out to elections between 1937 and 1943, when I left the AAA, it was a good meeting." See also W. W. Owens, Assistant Director, Utah State Agricultural Extension Service, "Annual Report 1934," typewritten (Logan: 1934), p. 9. After noting the good attendance at community educational meetings, Mr. Owens observed: "It was not possible to get as many out to subsequent meetings . . . even for the organization meetings."

[50] See *Agriculture Department Appropriation Bill 1943*, House Hearings, Part II, Jan. 24, 1942, p. 727. See also Carl T. Schmidt, *American Farmers in the World Crisis* (New York, 1941), p. 271: "Despite heavy participation in AAA programs and apparent acceptance of the AAA . . . the elections of local committeemen are frequently neglected . . . , in many . . . no more than fifteen or twenty farmers will turn out for a meeting."

[51] National Farmers Union, *Agriculture in the Service of Mankind, The Program of the National Farmers Union Adopted by Delegates to the 40th Annual Convention* (Denver, 1946), p. 6.

[52] See *Long-Range Agricultural Policy*, House Hearings, Part III, May 3, 1947, p. 383. See also Goss' statement before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in 1948 on S. 2318, which provided for a single county-elected committee to administer all departmental programs in each county: "Our general impression is that the proposal presupposes enough interest on the part of farmers to assure widespread participation in elections and selection of men thereby who are trained in meeting technical administrative responsibilities. We are not convinced that the results would be all that we might desire." *Agricultural Act of 1948*, Senate hearings (cited in n. 9), p. 141.

[53] Elmer Kruse, Manager, Commodity Credit Corporation, "Problems of the Commodity Credit Corporation and Their Relation to the Production and Marketing Ad-

This lack of interest, coupled with indirect election of county committeemen, has resulted in prolonged tenure for county committeemen and the subsequent development of a hard core of farmer committeemen. One state has reported that during the years 1933–36, with but few exceptions, "the officers of the control associations were reelected at the annual organizational meetings."[54] Gladys Baker observed that in the mid-west states "the change from the commodity to the conservation program did not result in a large turnover in the personnel of county committees" and that "a considerable number of committeemen appointed to the first temporary committees in 1933–1934 are now serving on agricultural conservation committees."[55] The largest turnover of county committeemen took place during the war years, 1943–45, when an average turnover of twenty per cent was reported.[56]

The question must now be considered as to why such a bureaucracy of professional farmer committeemen, having little to do with administration, has developed. One possible answer, and the one suggested here, is that committeemen have occupied a significant political position. The word "political" is not used here in the narrow sense of direct party activity.[57] Rather, the political role that committeemen have played has been that of promoters and defenders of the past Administration's agricultural policy. The solidarity of the farmer committeemen and the Administration is suggested by the statement of Ralph Trigg, PMA Administrator, that a deliberate policy of recruiting top level ad-

---

ministration," mimeographed (Washington: Production and Marketing Administration, 1948), pp. 2–5: "Is farmer thinking being reflected adequately in the administration of the price support program, especially with regard to local administration . . . ? I can tell you that it is a question that has been receiving very careful consideration . . . , nothing is gained . . . by assuming that operations, because they have always been handled a certain way, must continue to be handled that way. . . . I would like to suggest that you [state, county, and community committeemen] give particular consideration to the matter of bringing about greater farmer participation."

[54] W. W. Owens, Assistant Director, Utah State Agricultural Extension Service, "Annual Report 1935," typewritten (Logan, 1935), p. 1.

[55] *The County Agent*, p. 78. See also *Agriculture Department Appropriation Bill 1943*, House Hearings, Part II, Jan. 24, 1942, p. 727. A survey by the Department of Agriculture in twelve representative counties showed that of the 33 regular county committeemen in eleven counties, 61 per cent had been on the job five years or more; 12 per cent, four years; 12 per cent, three years; 3 per cent, two years; of the rest—about 12 per cent—one year or less. In four counties, all of the committeemen had served five years.

[56] See Annual Reports of the Chief of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, 1943, 1944, 1945, pages 19, 20, and 19, respectively.

[57] See Charles M. Hardin, "The Politics of Conservation: An Illustration," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 13, pp. 461–81 (Aug., 1951), at p. 473: "Has the PMA and the AAA before it been employed to further the ends of the Democratic Party? Allegations have been made that the committee system was used to support the Democratic Party organization as early as 1934. . . . One story which could probably be authenticated has it that a Washington AAA official attempted to use the committee system to collect Democratic campaign contributions in 1942 . . . , committeemen were given a choice 'between the hatchet and the Hatch Act.' In some PMA meetings after the 1948 elections, there was a disposition to claim credit for a share in President Truman's victory. PMA Committeemen were much in evidence at the midwestern Democratic rally in Des Moines, May, 1949. . . . "

ministrative officials from the farmer committee system had been followed not only in PMA but also by the Department of Agriculture.[58]

This political role of the farmer committee system appears to have been encouraged by the Department of Agriculture by means of two techniques: (1) the use of annual national conferences of state and county committeemen, and (2) the establishment of qualification requirements for state committeemen and county office personnel having little to do with technical competence.

Annual conferences were begun in the early 1930's. These conferences were ostensibly for the purpose of securing definite recommendations from committeemen on specific administrative problems relating to daily program operations as experienced in the field. For a number of years recommendations were earnestly sought and just as seriously given on detailed and specific problems by delegates.[59] The evidence indicates, however, that in recent years the major purpose of such conferences has been that of advancing the Administration's agricultural policy or proposed policy.[60]

For example, Ralph Trigg, then PMA Administrator, speaking at the 1948 PMA Conference, observed:

> A year ago at our Colorado Springs Conference, we tried the plan of having a number of specific committees to consider and report on all phases of our programs and operations. Looking back on the results of this effort, I can now report that it was successful beyond our most optimistic expectations. Every delegate at the conference sat with one of these working committees . . . the suggestions and recommendations were carefully tabulated and given direct and full consideration.
>
> In total, the conference committees last year submitted 180 rather definite recommendations. Many of the specific ones were put into effect at once. . . . Many of them were reflected in subsequent decisions and developments. . . . No one is going to tell you how to handle your discussions—what to discuss or what conclusions to reach. We want to hear from you. We want the benefit of your experience and judgment.[61]

---

[58] Ralph Trigg, "The Job Ahead," in the "Report of Proceedings of PMA National Conference 1948," mimeographed (Washington: Office of the Administrator, 1948), p. 5. See also United States Department of Agriculture, *Family Farm Policy Review* (Washington, 1951), p. 38: "Most county committeemen have been community committeemen and most State committeemen [appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture] have been county committeemen. Many of those in administrative positions in the Department in Washington have come up through the ranks."

[59] Interviews with former and present state and county committeemen who attended these conferences indicate that committee sessions were devoted in earnest to consideration of these matters. This is significant, since many of those interviewed were at that time and still are critics of the Democratic administration's policy.

[60] In general the addresses given by top level officials of the Department of Agriculture have not been concerned with problems of administration but with (1) problems of economic distress within agriculture, and (2) possible solutions for such problems. The major role that committeemen should play in providing these solutions has always been emphasized. In this respect, see the addresses by Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan and William B. Crowley, Assistant Administrator for Production, Production and Marketing Administration, in *Report of Proceedings of PMA National Conference 1948.*

[61] Ralph Trigg, "The Job Ahead" (cited in n. 58), pp. 7–8. Mr. Trigg reported the process of converting the recommendations into concrete policy as follows: "I asked each PMA Branch Director to study and analyze the reports carefully . . . [which] relate to the

This may be compared with Mr. Trigg's instructions for delegates to the 1949 National Conference:

> The return of crop surpluses has brought back the old problems of production adjustment and controls. The Congress, administrative agencies, farm organizations and farmers themselves are greatly concerned over the development of the soundest possible system of price supports to protect farm income. . . .
>
> These are all matters of direct concern to PMA. The job of developing and carrying out needed action programs will fall to us in large measure. . . . That's why it is a very good thing that we are meeting in conference at this time—to . . . agree upon general blueprints for the direction of our efforts. . . .
>
> In this connection, I want to explain why we have suggested a somewhat different plan with regard to committee reports or resolutions. We feel that we can accomplish more in getting at the fundamental thinking and broad recommendations of the conference if the committees are relieved of the task of trying to spell out exact details of program and policy recommendations. It is not possible to do this thoroughly in a large conference anyway, and too much of our limited time is spent in trying to reach agreement on specific points. . . .[62]

Why the change on the part of the Production and Marketing Administration as to (1) encouraging specific recommendations, and (2) not dictating procedures to be followed by the conference committees? The 1949 PMA Conference was political, not in a partisan but in a policy sense. It actually served as the first sounding board for the so-called Brannan Plan. It was expected that committeemen would serve as the "shock troops" to create a favorable attitude among farmers and their congressional representatives for the plan. It seems doubtful that such an obvious change in the purpose of the national conference, and the presentation of the Brannan Plan to the Congress four months later, were purely coincidental.

Concurrence with this view is found in recent testimony before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The Chairman of this committee, Democratic Senator John L. McClellan of Arkansas, observed:

> Well, it is a very doubtful procedure, I think, when you call the State Committee and all members of county committees in a State on some occasion to hear the Secretary of Agriculture speak, for instance, or someone representing the Department of Agriculture, you pay them for their attendance, their expenses, and then the discussion revolves around a highly controversial issue, some program sponsored by the administration that is very much opposed maybe, by some other political factions. Then the question arises: Is that politics . . . ? Certainly the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretaries within the Department, any member of the administration on a high level, a policy-making level, should have absolute freedom to go before the people and espouse that program and talk about its virtues and its advantages, and the benefits that flow from it, and everything else. But the only question I raise is when they pay the audience out of taxpayers' money

---

programs on administration of his Branch. I also appointed an over-all committee under the chairmanship of [the] . . . Director of the Budget and Management Branch. . . . Their job will be the tabulation and coordination of all recommendations, and the initiation of necessary steps to implement them as fully as possible."

[62] Ralph Trigg, "Address 1949 National PMA Conference," mimeographed (Washington: Office of the Administrator, 1949).

> to come to hear them speak. I raise that question. I think it is serious. I do not approve of it.[63]

The Secretary of Agriculture, however, in an address before the 1949 National PMA Conference, instructed the assembled committeemen that political activity was their duty.[64] Correctly or not, this is the way in which the farmer committeemen's participation in annual conferences has been directed and utilized.

In addition to annual conferences, the technique of imposing special and subjective qualification requirements for employment has also been relied upon in order to insure an organization team "correctly" oriented toward advancing proposed Administration agricultural policy. Appointment as state committeemen, and full-time employees at county levels, only of those individuals who have a sympathetic or at least neutral attitude toward the program seems at first glance to be a normal requirement rightly insisted upon by all administrators. However, in a situation such as we have here, where state and county committees which administered the programs are the exception, there seems to be another reason for such requirements, namely that of maintaining a hard core of personnel capable of espousing departmental policy.

At the state level, continuity of support of departmental policy is insured by providing that "no person may be appointed to a State Committee unless he receives the endorsement of the present State Committee."[65] At the county level, the objective is achieved by requiring that "applicants should believe in the Agricultural Conservation Program . . . , should be sympathetic with the program, and should have a farm background."[66]

Charles M. Hardin, however, has concluded that:

> . . . in certain administrative programs such as [those] of . . . PMA . . . , a superficial appearance of centralization and subsequent decentralization, subject to the organizing control of the USDA, veils significant developments. Thus real control over personnel and policies . . . tends to slip away from the Secretary of Agriculture and to become vested

---

[63] See *Reorganization of the Department of Agriculture* (Senate hearings cited in n. 6), pp. 44–45.

[64] The Secretary said: "The work of the committees is intensifying as farm income drops from postwar peaks and as production adjustments become necessary. Under these circumstances the Nation has reason to be thankful for the existence of a firmly established, democratic system of program administration and development. . . . All of us will not be 100 per cent satisfied with any legislation and will continue working for improvements—you by submitting recommendations to me through the PMA Administrator and I by working with the Congress . . . we are going to go right on working to improve the farm program and adapt it to the needs of our day," "Summary of Remarks, Annual Conference of PMA, Memphis, Tennessee, December 6, 1949," mimeographed (Washington: Office of the Secretary, 1949), pp. 2–3.

[65] Production and Marketing Administration, "Selection, Appointment, and Removal of State PMA Committeemen," mimeographed (Washington: Office of the Administrator, 1948), p. 1.

[66] For example, see Utah State PMA Committee, "Directive to PMA County Committee Chairmen Concerning Employment Procedure for County Offices," mimeographed (Salt Lake City: State Office, 1950), pp. 1–4.

> in chairmen (and others) of state PMA committees, who appear to be in a sufficiently strong position independently to modify departmental control. Again the question is pertinent: To whom are the state and local PMA committees responsible?
>
> The upshot of these questions as to controllability suggests that [it] . . . is quite conceivable that we will emerge with an agricultural field organization built upon a network of state and local farmer-elected committees which effectively interlock with influential persons in state and local farm organizations. Such organization would be responsible neither to the Secretary of Agriculture nor to any effective general electorate.[67]

It appears that the Department has adequately safeguarded against this possibility. In addition, Professor Hardin's view overlooks other facts which render it implausible. First, PMA state committeemen serve at the pleasure of the Secretary of Agriculture under one-year appointments.[68] Second, state committeemen have been chosen almost exclusively from county committeemen and state farmer fieldmen after a number of years of loyal service in such capacity.[69] In practice, how have state committeemen supported the Secretary and departmental proposals which have been opposed by the leaders of the general farm organizations? The answer: nearly 100 per cent. For example, PMA committeemen ardently pushed the Family Farm Policy Review and the proposed Brannan Plan, both of which were vigorously opposed by the American Farm Bureau Federation.[70]

The general farm organizations feel that policy formation of this type is their business—not that of people and governmental agencies given formal responsibility, at least, for the administration of public agricultural programs. The president of a midwestern state Farm Bureau Federation recently voiced their stand as follows:

> The job of determining the farmers' opinion of needed changes in law or policy should be left to the Congress. Independent farm organizations such as the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Farmers Union all have procedures for determining farm opinion and for advising the Congress of the consensus of farm opinion. . . . We should point out to our members the dangers involved in taking this method of collecting "grass-roots" opinion

---

[67] "Reflections on Agricultural Policy Formation in the United States," this REVIEW, Vol. 42, pp. 881–905 (Oct., 1948), at p. 884.

[68] See "Selection, Appointment, and Removal of State PMA Committeemen" (cited in n. 65), p. 1.

[69] United States Department of Agriculture, *Family Farm Policy Review*, p. 38. Professor Hardin himself has observed elsewhere: "Promotions from county committees to the state PMA committee in one mid-western state, at least, were based not only upon one's Democratic regularity but upon one's belonging to the right faction in the Democratic party—according to the declarations of a number of persons to the writer in 1948–50." See "The Politics of Conservation: An Illustration" (cited in n. 57), p. 473.

[70] One state Farm Bureau Federation urged its members not to participate in the Family Farm Policy Review and concluded: "We have many well-meaning and sincere people on local PMA and County Mobilization Committees throughout the state. I hope you can help them to understand the kind of cloth this thing is made of and the danger of misusing agricultural agencies this way." See E. Howard Hill, President, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation, "Letter to Farm Bureau Presidents, County Voting Delegates and County Women's Chairmen," mimeographed (Des Moines: IFBF, Aug. 16, 1951), p. 1.

> through biased governmental agencies. . . . The function of federal agencies is to administer programs, not to make policy. . . .[71]

It should be observed, however, that congressional committees, whether their members will admit it or not, are dependent to a large extent upon the recommendations of administrative agencies. A careful reading of the congressional hearings on every piece of major price support legislation indicates that recommendations of the Department of Agriculture form the basis of most such legislative enactments. Congressmen are reluctant to proceed to enact new legislation without departmental recommendations, based upon past administrative experience.[72] Only within this framework have farmer committees been given opportunity for local participation—and then their role has usually not been one of initiation but of loyal support of decisions taken at a higher level.

IV

The farmer committee system undertook to democratize administration. But it is necessary to distinguish between substantive participation and mere lip service to the ideal. Philip Selznick's warning concerning cooptation,[73] developed in his analysis of the use of local groups in the TVA programs, could well be applied to the use made of the farmer committee system in the administration of the price support and Agricultural Conservation Programs by the national administrative agency:

> Formal cooptation ostensibly shares authority, but in doing so is involved in a dilemma. The real point is the sharing of the public symbols or administrative burdens of authority, and consequently public responsibility, without the transfer of substantive power; it, therefore, becomes necessary to insure that the coopted elements do not get out of hand, do not take advantage of their formal position to encroach upon the actual arena of decision. Consequently, formal cooptation requires informal control over the coopted elements lest unity of command and decision be imperiled. This paradox is one of the sources

---

[71] *Ibid.* A realistic analysis of the controversy concerning who speaks for the farmers was made in 1949 by Secretary Brannan: "The leaders of some organizations apparently take the view that they and they alone speak for the farmers. They seem to feel that farmers and the Secretary of Agriculture should be gagged and muzzled unless their voices are filtered through the purifying plants of a particular organization.

"Let me tell you how I feel about that. First, we are not in competition with any farm organization. . . . The organizations have work to do that we can't do. We have work to do that they can't do. Farm people need both kinds of work done. Second, it is useless to argue about who speaks for the farmer. No person can honestly claim that he alone or his organization alone has that privilege. To do so is to sneer at democracy." "Summary of Remarks, Annual Conference of PMA" (cited in n. 64), pp. 2–3.

[72] A leading political scientist has observed: "Laws must be constantly adjusted to meet changed conditions and to reflect experience in their application. The administration in power must inevitably have an important share in the formulation of legislative measures. In our executive-legislative relationships, we have made little provision for an honest recognition of this necessity." V. O. Key, Jr., "Legislative Control," in *Elements of Public Administration*, ed. Fritz Morstein Marx (New York, 1946), pp. 349–50.

[73] *TVA and the Grass Roots* (Berkeley, Calif., 1949), p. 13: "Cooptation is the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy determining structure of an organization as a means of averting threat to, or increasing its stability or existence."

> of persistent tension between theory and practice in organizational behavior. The leadership, by the very nature of its position, is committed to two conflicting goals; if it ignores the need for participation, the goal of cooperation may be jeopardized; if participation is allowed to go too far, the continuity of leadership and policy may be threatened.[74]

This explains the manner in which the national administrative agency has maneuvered in its use of state, county, and community farmer committees.

The national administrative agency has been charged with a set of program responsibilities over the years which cannot be readily changed. It cannot escape the necessity of maintaining continuity of policy and definite lines of authority and responsibility. In practice, therefore, the forms of participation have been observed, but action has been so channeled as to fulfill the necessary administrative functions, with committeemen undertaking political rather than administrative activities. At the state level, the administrative responsibility has devolved to an executive officer; at the county level, to an office manager. The real lines of authority and responsibility have been maintained between these full-time appointed officials at state and county levels on the one hand and regional or area directors in Washington on the other. This development of informal lines of authority and responsibility has occurred because of the need of finding a method of accomplishing the national administrative agency's major purpose, one which the farmer committee, as an administrative device, could not supply. Indeed, it is doubtful if the outcome could have been otherwise.

---

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 261.

REFLECTIONS OF A LAW PROFESSOR ON INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*

KENNETH CULP DAVIS
University of Minnesota

Both political scientists and lawyers are in quest of better understanding of the same problems about the same processes of the same administrative agencies carrying out the same programs. Yet the two professional groups characteristically work quite independently of each other. Acting in the belief that both lawyers and political scientists should benefit by increased mutual criticism,[1] I propose to record my impressions of that area of political science which overlaps with and is contiguous to administrative law. The point of view will be that of one who is concerned primarily with law and legal education.

This paper is designed (1) to evaluate the case studies edited by Harold Stein, entitled *Public Administration and Policy Development,*[2] (2) to contrast with the case studies the basic method of instruction marked out by some of the conventional texts on public administration, (3) to criticize the undue emphasis upon broad perspective at the expense of detailed facts in the literature of public administration, (4) to call attention to the inordinate amount of misinformation about administrative law in some of the texts on public administration, (5) to express doubts about the choice of subject matter for some of the texts on public administration, and (6) to attempt constructive suggestions for further research on political science aspects of administrative law problems.

I. THE CASE STUDY METHOD

Each of the twenty-six case studies of the Stein collection is a high-fidelity recording of a governmental episode—something surprisingly rare in the literature of public administration. The actors are neither institutions nor departments nor agencies but individual human beings. They are confronted with down-to-earth details of today and tomorrow, of writing a letter or a memorandum, of participating in a conference, of immediate action. The people are real and are given their real names. The events are real events. The problems are in real contexts—the disorderly contexts of politics, of pressures, of personal ambitions mixed with altruistic ideals and high-minded conceptions of the public interest, of personalities as well as principles, of emotions as well as intellects. Most of the problems are at such a level that able administrators have found them challenging or even frustrating.

---

* Especially helpful suggestions have been made by Professors Marshall Dimock, Emmette Redford, William Anderson, Lloyd Short, George Warp, William Lockhart, and Monrad Paulsen. The usual remark that the responsibility is solely that of the writer has more than the usual significance.

[1] For significant criticisms of lawyers by political scientists in this field, see John Gaus, *Reflections on Public Administration* (University, Alabama, 1947), pp. 107–8; George A. Graham, "Trends in Teaching of Public Administration," *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 10, pp. 69–70 (Spring, 1950).

[2] (New York, 1952).

The main ingredient of each case study is facts—facts about individuals, facts about practices, facts about institutional arrangements, facts about political influences, and facts about the problems themselves. The facts are predominantly concrete, purposefully selected and deftly marshalled. Some of the studies include prefatory remarks to assist the reader's appreciation of central problems, organizing sections clarifying issues or pointing up alternative courses of action, and something by way of epilogue or afterthoughts. When the writers move from narrative to solutions, they always stay close to the facts; they never wander off into abstractions or unsupported generalizations. They apply constant pressure on the reader to do his own thinking, to struggle with the dilemmas the administrators have faced, and to discover limited lessons that are supported in whole or in part by the recorded experience.[3]

Altogether, the case studies in this volume are an extraordinary achievement. Their essential merit lies in the richness of the educational rewards inherent in the study of concrete problems on an adequate background of detailed facts. Although others may have tapped some portions of those riches, this may be the first time the rewards have been reaped with substantial fullness in treating this type of subject matter.

The achievement is all the more impressive, in comparison with the conventional texts on public administration. To that we now turn.

II. THE CONVENTIONAL METHOD OF INSTRUCTION

In contrast with the Stein case studies, in which the emphasis is so strongly upon the particularism of concrete problems, the conventional teaching materials in the field of public administration aim to give the student a selection of conclusions about the law and the governmental arrangements. The usual method is plain exposition in summary form, mostly abstract and general. Problems are almost entirely absent. Even the occasional illustrations tend to be abstract or general.

No professor in any leading law school of the United States would agree either with this primary objective or with this usual method. Perhaps in part because of so much experience with the case system, perhaps in part because of the inductive method of the common law, and perhaps in part because a familiarity with the nature of law produces distrust of abstractions and generalities, law professors quite uniformly are likely to commend the particularity of the Stein approach.

---

[3] Case studies like those of the Stein collection are unknown to legal education. The case method of law schools is limited almost altogether to study of opinions of appellate courts. Indeed, the appellate opinion is the obsession of today's legal education.

Yet lawyers are devoting their time less and less to litigation and more and more to avoiding litigation—advising, planning, managing, negotiating, transacting, drafting. Legal education needs a basic shift toward lawyers' problems that are unrelated to litigation; problems of what-to-do instead of problems of who-should-win; problems of choosing among practical policies, not further exercises in analytical refinements; problems involving the kind of facts that lawyers must consider in advising businessmen, not merely neat summaries of facts in appellate opinions; problems intertwined with business or politics or technology, not merely interpreting statutes or applying judge-made law. The precise need of legal education seems to me to be the successful application of the Stein method to that part of the business of a law office that never goes to court. Such a project would be exceedingly difficult. But it can be done, and it should be done.

Furthermore, the educational goal, in the opinion of law professors, should be to impart understanding, not information. Understanding is developed less by exposure to the conclusions of others than by participating in the solution of problems. Our governmental system is the sum of the choices that have been made in the past; the student must be made to see each crucial problem, the alternative courses of action, the reasons for the decisions that society has made, the reasons for the rejected views, and the consequences of the decisions. A mere statement of conclusions may give information, but it can seldom produce understanding.

These remarks seem to me peculiarly applicable to the treatments of legal problems in the texts on public administration. I shall make my point with one example.

One of the best of the conventional texts on public administration is the third edition of the book by Leonard D. White.[4] At p. 575 the student is told: "The foundation of judicial control over administrative acts rests in the Anglo-American doctrine of the rule of law. The classic concept is that of Dicey." Then Dicey is quoted as saying that "every official, from the Prime Minister down to a constable or a collector of taxes, is under the same responsibility for every act done without legal justification as any other citizen." White asserts: "This rule was brought to the United States as a part of the common law heritage and has been universally accepted."

Now what does the diligent student have, from the standpoint of educational values, when he has mastered these various assertions of conclusions about the law? It seems to me that at best the student can derive nothing but a few bits of information or misinformation from these assertions.

How can the same subject be presented to provide understanding instead of mere information, and at the same time to protect against misinformation? The answer is by using some method resembling either the Stein method or that of the usual law school casebook. The student must be led to participate in the thinking. Exposition must be supplanted by problems. Generalities have to give way to, or at least be preceded by, particulars. Abstractions have to yield to or be supported by concrete examples.

This way: Anthrax is a contagious disease that kills cattle. Mr. Conroy, a livestock inspector for Wisconsin, looks over a herd of cattle owned by farmer Lowe. He discovers a sick cow. Fearing anthrax, he examines a smear of the cow's blood under a microscope, finds anthrax, and orders the herd destroyed. Mr. Lowe thus loses his life's savings, cattle worth $10,000. But Lowe can't sue the state because long tradition has made it immune to liability in tort. If Lowe sues Conroy and proves that Conroy was mistaken, but if Conroy shows that the mistake was a reasonable one that a careful officer might make in the circumstances, should Conroy be liable? Conroy's salary is $5,000 a year, he has three children, and he has made a down payment on a $10,000 home. The student must struggle with the problem: Would it be a good idea to have a "rule of law" like Dicey's? If liability is imposed, what will be the probable effect on the future spread of anthrax?

---

[4] Leonard D. White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, 3rd ed. (New York, 1948).

After the student has been led to think through the problem of *Lowe* v. *Conroy,*[5] he is then prepared for his own critical examination of Dicey's so-called "rule of law." He may quickly appreciate the serious error of White's statement that Dicey's rule of law is "a part of the common law heritage and . . . universally accepted."

But here again, the best road to this conclusion may be by way of concrete problems. If a judge of a regular court makes a decision in bad faith, should the losing party be allowed to sue the judge for damages? If losing parties can sue judges and allege bad faith, will that be destructive of judicial responsibility? Will financially responsible men accept judicial office if they are to be subjected to that kind of suit? Almost any clear-minded student will answer these questions the way the United States Supreme Court answered them in 1871 in the leading case of *Bradley* v. *Fisher*[6]: "It is a general principle of the highest importance to the proper administration of justice that a judicial officer, in exercising the authority vested in him, shall be free to act upon his own convictions, without apprehension of personal consequences to himself . . . the principle . . . obtains in all countries where there is any well-ordered system of jurisprudence."

The next step is to decide whether the immunity that judges enjoy should be extended to administrative adjudicators. The Supreme Court has given the answer most alert students will give: an officer who performs a judicial function has to be immune to personal liability for the decision made, whether the officer is a judge or an administrator.[7] Then the student may be given specific information about the immunity principle and how far it has been carried.

The student will now be prepared to learn more about Dicey—perhaps through a problem involving the Prime Minister, who according to Dicey, is under the same responsibility as any other citizen, for every act done without justification. The student will quickly see how utterly impracticable it would be to impose personal liability upon the Prime Minister on account of performance of his official duties. Then the student will be ready to appraise the views of Dicey's fellow Englishmen, who have rejected Dicey's rule of law, just as Americans have generally rejected it, and just as both English and American courts have generally rejected it. Mr. E. C. S. Wade, who wrote the introduction to the ninth edition of Dicey's book, published in 1939, acknowledged that Dicey "seems . . . not sufficiently to have regarded the immunities . . . [of] Crown servants. . . . "[8]

---

[5] I have altered somewhat the facts of *Lowe* v. *Conroy*, 120 Wis. 151, 97 N.W. 942 (1904). Contra: *Raymond* v. *Fish*, 51 Conn. 80 (1883).

[6] 13 Wall. 335, 347 (1871).

[7] *Kendall* v *Stokes*, 3 How. 87, 97 (1845); *Spalding* v. *Vilas*, 161 U.S. 483, 498 (1896).

Although White is seriously mistaken in his statement about the rule of law, my point does not concern the rule of law, but relates to the method of instruction. The conventional texts on public administration seem to me unsound in assuming that primary educational values inhere in mere knowledge. I believe the proper objective is not to teach someone's conclusions but to provide experience in thinking processes, to demonstrate how conclusions are reached, to consider pros and cons, to weigh alternatives. The goal is understanding, and no one can develop understanding of human institutions without thinking through the problems that have demanded solution. This can seldom be accomplished on a level of abstraction. A principal tool must be concrete and particular problems.

In his twentieth and last annual report as President of Harvard University, Dr. James Bryant Conant calls the Graduate School of Public Administration a "complete failure . . . in interfaculty cooperation." Then he says: "The great success of the Business School during the war years in training supply officers for the armed services and analyzing many logistic problems might be said to justify those who see this faculty of the University as the one academic group which knows how to teach 'administration.' . . . I suggest the key to the success has been the insistent and persistent use of the highly expensive case method of instruction."[9]

Of course, I do not mean that the case method should be the exclusive method for teaching public administration. I do mean that the merits of the case method may be insufficiently appreciated by most teachers of public administration. True, the case method is time-consuming, and subject matter can be covered far more rapidly by straight exposition. But what have we accomplished when we have "covered " subject matter? What is our objective? Which student comes closer to the desired educational values—the one who thinks through a series of problems about liability of government officers for their torts, or the one who memorizes a batch of abstract and erroneous generalizations like Dicey's rule of law?[10]

---

[8] Pp. xcii, lxviii. For other rejections of Dicey's rule of law, see W. A. Robson, *Justice and Administrative Law*, 3d ed. (London, 1951), pp. 437–44; Ivor Jennings, *The Law and the Constitution*, 2d ed. (London, 1939), pp. 285–97.

[9] Pp. 19–20.

[10] A reviewer of the Stein book exalts "the rich, though more traditional, literature of public administration" and declares: "The cases so far collected do not lead toward the kind of generalizations about the administrative process that would contribute significantly toward expanding the part of public administration that might be thought of as science rather than art. Cases are necessarily particularistic." James W. Fesler, book review, *Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 61, p. 1238 (1952). I wonder whether the literature of public administration can be either "rich" or "science" unless it is solidly based upon "particularistic" studies.

III. PERSPECTIVE VERSUS DETAIL

An outstanding virtue of the Stein case studies is that the authors do not stand off at a distance and discuss the forests as patches of green on the hillsides. The case studies concentrate upon the trees, the trunks, the branches, the bark, the roots. The trees are even laid bare, and the texture of the wood is seen and felt.

A dominant characteristic of the conventional literature of public administration is such preoccupation with the patches of green that too little effort is made to dig into the wood. Of course I do not ignore the occasional factual studies. Nor do I deny the utility of perspective or of theory, or of hypothesis based upon perspective. But perspective and theory should not be used as a substitute for detailed facts which a little investigation will make available.

For illustration, let us examine one of the seminal works—the influential report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management. I propose to demonstrate that this committee relied primarily upon theory and perspective even though an investigation of the detailed facts would have led to sharply different conclusions. And—what is more significant—the report did not inspire other political scientists to rush in with the needed facts.

A fair sample of the Committee's method is found in that part of the report dealing with the independent regulatory commissions. The Committee does not start with the details of experience and then cautiously extract factual conclusions as a basis for discovery of theory or principle. Instead, it begins with theory. After an introductory paragraph, the Committee immediately announces that the independent regulatory commissions "do violence to the basic theory of the American Constitution that there should be three major branches of the Government and only three."[11] Where does the theory come from? The Committee does not tell us. The source is not the Constitution, for although the Constitution sets up three branches, it says nothing about "only three." The source is not the men who have in fact molded our governmental system, for we do have the independent agencies. The source is not the Supreme Court, for the Supreme Court probably would not even listen to an argument that establishment of independent agencies is unconstitutional. Above all, the source is not an investigation of experience.

The Committee's only facts in support of its theory are generalizations—indeed, grossly exaggerated generalizations: "The Congress has found no effective way of supervising [the independent agencies], they cannot be controlled by the President, and they are answerable to the courts only in respect to the legality of their activities."[12] But where are the facts? How much supervision have congressional committees in fact provided? What are the detailed relations between, say, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Interstate Commerce Commission? What is the meaning of the large number of amendments of the Interstate Commerce Act during the past sixty-five years? What do appropriations committees and subcommittees do by way of supervising? What does experience show as to how much congressional supervision is desirable, and on what subjects? Has congressional supervision been excessive in some instances? On problems calling for exercise of professional skills, does experience show the need of some degree of independence? The President's Committee ignores such questions as these. It sees only patches of green on the hillsides. If it had cut into some wood, its conclusions might well have been radically different.[13]

---

[11] Report of the President's Committee, p. 40 (1937).

[12] *Ibid.*

The Committee's broad generalizations were not based upon staff studies containing the supporting factual materials, even though the Committee was assisted by a staff of twenty-seven. The staff study of the independent regulatory commissions was directed by Professor Robert E. Cushman. The Cushman report begins with abstract generalizations, not with facts; on the first page appears the unsupported generalization that "the multiplication of these independent bodies tends inevitably toward a decentralized and chaotic administrative system."[14] This is the foliage seen at a distance; where is the wood? What, if any, are the facts about chaos? On what specific occasions, if any, has the system proved itself to be chaotic, and in connection with what programs?[15] The Cushman report does not answer such questions as these.[16] The method is to glance at the perspective and to announce that the system of the independent agencies is " . . . inevitably . . . chaotic. . . . "

---

[13] Commissioner Eastman of the ICC knew the particulars about these questions. See his testimony, *Hearings before the Select Committee on Government Organization, on S. 2700*, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 180 (1937). Commissioner Eastman's testimony sharply contrasts with the factual conclusions of the President's Committee.

[14] Report, p. 207.

[15] The closest approach in the Cushman report to factual detail is an account in a few sentences of a statement by President Hoover in 1930 which, according to Cushman, "was intended to influence them [the ICC] on a matter of policy so important that it was bound to obtrude itself upon the President's broad economic program" (p. 221). But this is still only foliage. For what was President Hoover's "broad economic program"? If it existed, did it differ from ICC policies? Did the ICC do something that impaired the President's program? Were effective means available for producing whatever coordination was needed? Wherein, if at all, would the result have been different if the ICC functions had been performed by an executive department headed by a cabinet officer?

Cushman also quoted President Hoover's statement in 1929 about the Supreme Court's decision in the *O'Fallon* case: "I am confident that there will be no increase in railway rates as a result of the O'Fallon case." But Cushman expressed no opinion as to whether the President should be able to control the ICC on a problem of rate levels. That question may be appropriate for a long and penetrating study by political scientists; it can hardly be disposed of satisfactorily in an offhand paragraph.

[16] At p. 221 of the Cushman report appears a heading, "Interference with Presidential Management in the Field of Administration." But the ensuing discussion is mostly generalities. One of the most specific statements is: "Several agencies besides the Federal Trade Commission have authority over unfair trade practices, but there is no central authority that can whip conflicting policies into line." The statement is true. But the assumption that central management is necessarily indicated may be unsound. This is precisely the point at which a study of experience would be profitable. What have been

The Committee's major recommendation concerning the independent regulatory agencies rested upon a serious misunderstanding that would not have occurred if the Committee had patiently studied the detailed facts. The recommendation was to break down each commission into two sections, a Judicial Section that would remain independent, and an Administrative Section that would be fully responsible to the Cabinet Officer and the President. "The Administrative Section must not do judicial work . . . The Judicial Section must not do policy-determining work."[17] The President's Committee asserted that "This proposed plan meets squarely the problems presented by the independent commissions."[18]

If instead of dealing only in perspectives the Committee had dug into a few specific cases of administrative adjudication it would quickly have seen the impossibility of its proposal. The essence of administrative adjudication is the formulation of policy through case-to-case development. What happens under the Committee's proposal when the adjudication of a particular case requires the determination of a question of policy? The answer is that either the Judicial Section must decide the question of policy, thereby defeating the plan's central objective of bringing all policy determination under the control of the President and the Secretary, or the Administrative Section must perform the judicial function of deciding the case, thereby defeating the plan's important objective of keeping judicial work free from executive control.[19]

The President's Committee misunderstood the most elementary facts about adjudication. The idea that the Judicial Section should decide cases but "must not do policy-determining work" misconceives the nature of the function of deciding cases. Judicial officers cannot decide cases without determining policy, for the issues in the cases to be decided are often policy issues.[20]

---

the consequences of lack of central authority in this one field? When one agency has been lethargic, has another protected the public interest? What harm, if any, has resulted from conflicting policies? A theory about need for central management will hardly answer questions of this type.

[17] Report, p. 230.

[18] Report, p. 41.

[19] If any reader doubts this, let him examine specific cases of administrative adjudication. An easy example is the problem that came to the Supreme Court in *FCC* v. *WOKO*, 329 U. S. 223 (1946). In a proceeding on an application for renewal of a broadcasting license, the evidence showed that the applicant in a former application misrepresented the identity of its shareholders. The only relevant statute required applicants to set forth facts "as to citizenship, character, and financial, technical, and other qualifications." The Commission has to make its own policy when particular misrepresentations are brought to light, necessarily relying upon full development of all facts and circumstances. Because the facts were undisputed, the only question for the Commission was one of policy.

No set of rules could conceivably answer all the questions of policy that may arise in adjudications. And some important agencies, notably the FTC and NLRB, have no substantive rule-making power concerning their main functions. Whether or not the mind of man may some day invent a way to escape from the need for deciding policy issues in particular cases, we may be sure that no such invention has yet appeared.

[20] Escape from the dilemma cannot be effected by having the Judicial Section refer

The Committee's misconception resulted from the basic attitude that the Committee could deal with the large problems of organization and leave the details to others to be worked out later.[21] Yet the large problems could be understood only by mastering the details. To me the most amazing feature of the Committee's performance was its specific assertion that it had no concern for detail. Its representative, Luther Gulick, a member of the Committee, said before the Senate Committee: "We do not specify, nor have we determined, nor have we made the kind of study which would make it possible to say exactly how the division of functions should be made, or could be made, in any given office."[22]

The proposal to set up a system of adjudication from which policy determination would be excluded was so clearly impossible of attainment that it was sure to fail as soon as the rudimentary facts about adjudication were brought out. The plan in fact did crumble under the scrutiny of the congressional committees. Indeed, Dr. Gulick could not answer even the simplest questions about specific application of the broad proposal:

> Senator Byrd: You understand what I am trying to arrive at. Just answer in your own way.
>
> Mr. Gulick: Then, Senator, stating it in my own way, you want me to name the commissions which should be torn apart and where their parts should be put?
>
> Senator Byrd: No; only in the broad scope of dividing the administrative functions from the judicial.
>
> Mr. Gulick: The broad scope cannot be answered, except in terms of the specific organizations, because some commissions should be treated in one way and some in another.
>
> Senator Byrd: What would you recommend that should be done with the Interstate Commerce Commission?
>
> Mr. Gulick: I do not know.
>
> Senator Byrd: I have nothing further.[23]

Later Commissioner Eastman of the ICC gave the congressional committee an analysis of the proposed bill based upon the report of the President's

---

questions of policy to the Administrative Section, for then the decision will be made by the Administrative Section, which will then be doing the judicial work of deciding the particular case.

Even when the specific policy issues can be anticipated, some of them can be better handled through adjudication rather than through rule making. The choice between rule making and adjudication is often very difficult and cannot be resolved in wholesale fashion; particular solutions must depend upon circumstances. For a difficult problem concerning choice between policy making through rules or through adjudication, see the majority and dissenting opinions in *SEC* v. *Chenery Corp.*, 332 U.S. 194 (1947).

[21] The staff of the President's Committee was seriously mistaken about elementary features of FTC procedure. Compare the discussion of the "eleven steps" at p. 231 of the Report with the FTC Monograph prepared for the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure. The staff's worst error was the idea that the Commission holds hearings before issuing complaints. This error substantially affected the major recommendation.

[22] *Hearings before the Select Committee on Government Organization, on S. 2700,* 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 99 (1937).

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 98–99.

Committee. He concluded with a statement that "those who advocate a change ought to present a specific statement of the ills which they want to cure and how they propose to cure them, after a careful analysis of the Commission's work, and in consultation with those directly concerned with it. Nothing of that kind has been done, to our knowledge. All that we have is the vaguest and most indefinite of generalities."[24]

After that, the proposal to have one group determine policy and another group decide cases was not again given serious consideration. The proposal died because the vision behind it went only to the green patches on the hillside.

After Congress rejected the proposed plan, what was the impact of the report of the President's Committee on political scientists? Did they recognize the inadequacy of the factual inquiry and take steps to correct it? To an amazing extent, other political scientists have accepted the factual conclusions and the theories of the President's Committee without questioning them. Professor Lindsay Rogers wrote a warm endorsement of the Committee's analysis of the problem of the independent regulatory agencies.[25] The Brookings Institution criticized adversely the Committee's plan of separating administrative and judicial action, but it did not supply the needed factual investigation.[26] Some of the texts merely parroted the Committee report. Pfiffner, for instance, asserts dogmatically that "The tendency toward infinite expansion of administrative units, each separate and independent from the others, raised obstacles to the proper fulfillment of presidential responsibility."[27] But Pfiffner does not examine specific obstacles to see whether they are real or imaginary or whether they can be easily hurdled. Other texts boosted the unsupported theory further up into the sky. An example of a textwriter who begins with the Committee's factual assumptions and adds to them his own factual assumptions is Graves, who instructs the users of his text that "Each of these agencies proceeds in its own way without any effective supervision on the part of the chief executive or any attempt to coordinate the administrative aspects of its activities with the policies and procedures of the administration as a whole."[28] Surely the many officers of the government who have been dealing with problems of coordination would be startled to learn of the absence of "any attempt to coordinate."

---

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 182.

[25] Lindsay Rogers, "The Independent Regulatory Commissions," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 52, pp. 1–17 (March, 1937).

[26] *Report to the Select Committee to Investigate the Executive Agencies of the Government*, Sen. Committee Print No. 10, 75th Cong., 1st sess., p. 92 (1937): Regulatory cases involve "an inseparable mixture of policy-determination, fact-finding, and decision" and "often cannot be broken up into component elements of administration and adjudication." Schuyler Wallace, in *Federal Departmentalization* (New York, 1941), p. 167, rejected the recommendation of the President's Committee on the basis of an overstatement: "The truth of the matter is that a differentiation between the administrative, quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial aspects of the work of these commissions is almost impossible except in the realm of theory." Although the differentiation is difficult or impossible near the borderlines, it is also often easy; for instance, all would agree that an unfair-practice case in the FTC or NLRB is judicial or quasi-judicial. A disagreement with the President's Committee on theoretical grounds also was presented by Blachly and Oatman, *Federal Regulatory Action and Control* (Washington, 1940).

Thirteen years after the report of the President's Committee, a political scientist at last analyzed the Committee's proposal in the light of the detailed facts of a regulatory commission. See Charles Hyneman, *Bureaucracy in a Democracy* (New York, 1950), pp. 498–519. He says (p. 513): "The President's Committee stated that the division of work which it proposed between judicial and nonjudicial aspects 'would be relatively simple.' . . . I find it much easier to believe that the members of the Committee and the persons on whom they relied for advice did not know what the problems were." Hyneman's treatment has been called "as lethal a critique of the recommendations of the President's Committee on Administrative Management regarding regulatory commissions as has come to this reader's attention." Merle Fainsod, "The Presidency and Congress," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 11, pp. 119–24 (Spring, 1951). See also Emmette S. Redford, *Administration of National Economic Control* (New York, 1952), p. 315: "More significant than application of law to facts is expansion of policy through case-to-case administration. It is submitted that the argument for independent placement breaks down where policy cannot be made specific in advance of the exercise of the judicial function."

Happily, a technique of factual inquiry was finally brought to bear upon the supposition of the President's Committee that the system of independent regulatory agencies is "inevitably . . . chaotic. . . . " This was done by a task force for the Hoover Commission.[29] The task force was not content with either theory or broad perspectives; members of its staff wrote detailed monographs about each of the independent regulatory agencies. For instance, the monograph on the Federal Trade Commission is about 150 pages of single-spaced mimeographing, concisely written. Full and perceptive treatment is given to relations of the Commission with the President, with Congress, with the Anti-trust Division of the Department of Justice, with the Food and Drug Administration, and with other agencies. An account is given of specific problems of coordination and of the methods of handling each one.

Having the various studies by the authors of the monographs, the task force was able to base its report upon the detailed facts. Referring to the idea that independence of regulatory agencies impairs coordination with the President's policies, the task force said: "Frequently, this criticism appears to be based mainly on theoretical or doctrinal grounds and not on actual failures of coordination among agencies."[30] The main conclusions of the task force are inconsistent with the theories that guided the President's Committee:

> As would be expected, it was found that a large part of the work of most of the commissions is not closely related to that of the rest of the Government and requires no active coordination to avoid conflicts. . . .
>
> The point to be emphasized here is that the study of the separate agencies forces the

---

[27] Pfiffner, *Public Administration*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1946), p. 463.

[28] Graves, *Public Administration in a Democratic Society* (Boston, 1950), p. 670. See also Leonard White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* (cited in n. 4), p. 109.

[29] The task force was made up of a law professor and an industrialist. The Hoover Commission is said to have "largely passed over . . . university faculties of political science, and bureaus of public administration when it selected its staff." James C. Charlesworth, *Governmental Administration* (New York, 1951), p. 230.

[30] Task Force Report on Regulatory Commissions, pp. 25–26 (1949).

> conclusion that lack of coordination is not an insuperable obstacle with respect to the independent commissions. As has already been stated, some problems do exist and should be dealt with. But on the whole, coordination is needed in more limited areas than might be supposed a priori, and has been achieved in most of the major fields through interdepartmental committees or more informal techniques. . . .
>
> On this question, the actual experience is far more convincing than theory.[31]

The last sentence is worth repeating, because it embodies a major point I am trying to make: "On this question, the actual experience is far more convincing than theory."

My thesis here is a constructive one. It is not that the President's Committee was wrong, but that the present generation of political scientists, with all too rare exceptions, seems content to accept conclusions founded upon theory even with respect to a subject that readily lends itself to rather easy factual investigation. I believe that the literature of public administration relies unduly upon abstraction and perspective, and not enough upon close investigation. Not only do the method of the Stein case studies[32] and the method of the law school case book deserve greater emphasis in instruction, but research and the general literature need to deal more intensively and more concretely with particular and narrow problems. Professor Bailey's little book, *Congress Makes a Law*, is an example of a technique of writing and thinking that political scientists are too much neglecting.

The next hundred books on public administration will advance understanding only comparatively little if they begin and end with perspective, theory, and abstraction. But what tremendous progress a hundred books can make in the field of public administration if enough of them contribute to a solid foundation of detailed experience and if the super-structure of the literature rests firmly on that foundation!

IV. MISINFORMATION ABOUT ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

To write a reliable summary of the major principles of a complex body of law is a task of considerable difficulty. Such a summary probably can be written only by one who has first developed his own basic understanding of the subject matter. The texts on public administration that include substantial discussions of administrative law show rather clearly that the textwriters have developed no such basic understanding. The resulting summaries are in a fundamental sense seriously misleading. The proportion of misinformation is exceedingly high. Even the most elementary ideas are often flagrantly in error.

Because these rather sweeping conclusions of mine should carry little weight without a supporting demonstration, I must set forth samples of misinformation. To minimize possible embarrassment I shall use numbers instead of names of authors and titles of books.

---

[31] *Ibid.*, at pp. 26–28.

[32] The case of "The Sale of the Tankers," at pp. 445–532 of the Stein collection, involves a problem of coordinating policy among the State Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission. The recalcitrant was not the independent agency but the Navy Department, which for a time resisted a decision by the President's Cabinet.

Book 1. The first edition of this book was published in 1935 and the revised edition in 1946. My comments are limited to pages 477–82 of the revised edition.[33] The first sentence on page 477 says: "In the United States there is no legal limit upon the right of courts to review the decisions of administrative tribunals." The law in fact imposes many limits. Statutes sometimes withdraw jurisdiction of courts to review.[34] Statutes often provide that administrative determinations shall be final.[35] Statutes usually forbid judicial substitution of judgment on questions of fact and on many questions of discretion.[36] Courts have placed many limitations upon their own power to review.[37] And the Constitution has been interpreted as forbidding so-called constitutional courts from providing a de novo review of administrative action that is deemed nonjudicial.[38]

On the same page we are told: "Legislatures cannot insulate administration against judicial review by introducing into the statute clauses designed to thwart review." Not only can legislatures do this but they do it, and the courts usually give effect to what they do. The first few words in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act are: "Except so far as statutes preclude review. . . ."[39]

On the next page the author asserts: "As a general rule, courts attempt to distinguish between questions of law and fact by reviewing the former and not the latter." Under the dominant doctrine the courts review findings of fact to the extent of determining whether they are supported by substantial evidence, and this means that many orders are set aside that would stand if the courts did not review the facts.[40]

---

[33] During the summer of 1953 a third edition of this book has been published. Some of the new errors in the new edition are even more astonishing than those in the second edition. For instance, page 487: "The present requirement is that 'substantial evidence' must be found throughout the entire record to support administrative action. . . . Prior to the Administrative Procedure Act, the general practice of the courts had been to sustain agency findings if adequate evidence could be found *anywhere* in the record." The phrase "throughout the record" appears five times on this one page, and numerous times on other pages. Not only does the Act contain no such phrase, but the slightest reflection will show why a reviewing court could not require substantial evidence "throughout the record." If in a thousand-page record, 990 pages are devoted to unconvincing circumstantial evidence on one side, and ten pages to convincing direct evidence on the other side, should a reviewing court hold that the agency may not believe the direct evidence?

[34] E.g., 54 *Stat.* 1197 (1940), 38 *U.S.C.* §11a–2 (1946); 48 *Stat.* 9 (1933), 38 *U.S.C.* §705 (1946).

[35] In *First Moon* v. *White Tail*, 270 U.S. 243 (1926), the Court held that the lower court had no jurisdiction to review where the statute provided that the determination of the Secretary of the Interior should be "final and conclusive" of an Indian allotment. For other examples, see Kenneth Culp Davis, *Administrative Law*, §238 (St. Paul, 1951).

[36] An early such provision, copied in many later federal statutes, is in the Federal Trade Commission Act, 38 *Stat.* 717 (1914), 15 *U.S.C.* §41 (1946).

[37] An outstanding early example is *ICC* v. *Union Pac. R. Co.*, 222 U.S. 541 (1912).

[38] E.g., *Federal Radio Comm.* v. *General Elec. Co.*, 281 U.S. 464 (1930).

[39] 60 *Stat.* 239 (1946), 5 *U.S.C.* §1011 (1946).

[40] E.g., *Universal Camera Corp.* v. *NLRB*, 340 U.S. 474 (1951).

At page 480 Book 1 says that "the courts normally will refuse to interfere with immigration orders for deportation." This is plainly false. In many hundreds of cases the courts have interfered; the review of deportation orders makes up a large portion of all review of federal administrative action.[41]

Book 1 asserts at page 481: "It is not easy to get the courts to reverse Post Office Department fraud orders, because the attitude is taken that the government is performing a business service to individuals on favorable terms." The courts have no such attitude. Fraud orders are as freely reviewed as any other orders, and the scope of review is the usual one. The decision establishing reviewability came in 1902.[42]

Again: "The courts also find themselves averse to reviewing cases involving a necessary function of government, such as the collection of revenue." Tax cases in fact make up a large portion of all the business of federal courts; 485 cases came directly to courts of appeals from federal agencies during 1950, and of these cases 239 were tax cases.[43]

Book 2. This text, published in 1951, contains ten statements on pages 136–46 that seem to me misleading or false.[44] For instance: "If a question has been considered and decided by a court, and a superior court declines to reopen it, the matter is called res judicata." Since the basic purpose of the principle of res judicata is to prevent the same parties from litigating the same claims or issues a second time, the law is that if a matter is res judicata, it cannot again be considered by the same court, by a court of equal rank, by an inferior court, or by a superior court. Book 2 goes on to say that "the generalization is that an administrative determination will stand, as res judicata unless . . . there has been honest error, or . . . additional material information has come to light." The author does not even understand that the primary purpose of the doctrine of res judicata is to prevent the correction of "honest error" and to prevent the reopening of cases when additional material information comes to light.[45]

---

[41] In *Bridges* v. *Wixon,* 326 U.S. 135 (1945), the Court's review may even have gone beyond what is generally considered proper under the substantial-evidence rule.

[42] *American School of Magnetic Healing* v. *McAnnulty,* 187 U.S. 94 (1902). For a recent review of a fraud order, see *Reilly* v. *Pinkus,* 338 U.S. 269 (1949).

[43] Annual Report, Director of Administrative Office of the United States Courts, p. 103 (1950).

[44] Other statements in addition to those discussed above also seem to me erroneous. Book 1 says at page 136 that when the elements of a decision can be separated so as to identify clear-cut law, "the court will rule on the law involved"; for one of the many cases of a court's refusal to rule on the law involved, see *Switchmen's Union* v. *National Mediation Board,* 320 U.S. 397 (1943). On page 138 the author relies on *Ohio V. W. Co.* v. *Ben Avon Borough,* 253 U.S. 387 (1920), with no indication that it may no longer be law, having been superseded by such cases as *FPC* v. *Hope Nat. Gas Co.,* 320 U.S. 591 (1944), and *Railroad Comm.* v. *Rowan & Nichols Co.,* 310 U.S. 573 (1940). Page 142, statement that res judicata "operates against retroactive administrative action," whereas agencies often act retroactively; the Supreme Court ordered an agency to make law and apply it retroactively in *Addison* v. *Holly Hill,* 322 U.S. 607 (1944). Page 142, citing *Arizona Grocery Co.* v. *Atchison, T. & S. F. Ry.,* 284 U.S. 370, 389 (1932) in support of res judicata when the court specifically said that the Commission was "not bound by the rule of res judicata." Page 142, statement that the Labor Board may not reopen a case; this statement is mostly false because *International Union* v. *Eagle-Picher Co.,* 325 U.S. 335 (1945) rests on a special statutory provision.

Book 2 says at page 144: "Utility rate proceedings are usually classed by courts as legislative but they are really judicial because confiscation of private property is the basic issue." The fact is that only a small minority of utility rate cases involve an issue of confiscation; perhaps confiscation is an issue in less than one per cent of ICC rate cases. I see no educational value—indeed, I see harm to educational objectives—in telling a student that what the courts call legislative is "really judicial," without stating the purposes and the effects of such labeling, and without stating reasons pro and con.

At page 146 Book 2 says without qualification: "The decision in quasi-judicial cases should be made by the same person or persons who have conducted the hearing." If this were true, the examiner system, the mainstay of administrative adjudication, would be destroyed. Even in the first *Morgan* case,[46] which Book 2 cites, the Court approved hearings before examiners and decisions by other officers.

Book 3. My comments on this text, published in 1950, are limited to Chapter 30.[47] Book 3 says at page 604: "The use of the rule-making authority may be authorized, unauthorized, or extraordinary or emergency. . . . Where not authorized, it is forbidden." The student may have difficulty with the idea that "The use of . . . authority . . . may be . . . unauthorized." Rule-making authority often exists when it is not explicitly granted. Lawyers and courts consider that power is either granted or withheld, that it may be granted either explicity or implicitly, but that unless it is granted it is withheld and therefore forbidden.

Book 3 says at page 605: "It should not be necessary to wait until someone claims that his rights have been impaired before one can ascertain whether a rule is legal or what the rule means. As Professor (X) has said, 'It is the sheerest of nonsense that a regulation cannot be read or a statute understood without an official act of injury predicated upon them'." The fact is that the Supreme Court has consistently taken the position that is here branded as nonsense.[48] Of course I do not object to condemnation of Supreme Court decisions. But I think it egregiously unsound in a student text to take a vehement position that is opposed to established law, without stating what the law is, and without mention of reasons pro or con.

---

[45] For a full discussion of res judicata, see Davis, *Administrative Law,* pp. 563–613.

[46] *Morgan* v. *United States,* 298 U.S. 468, 481 (1936).

[47] In addition to errors mentioned above, the following are especially important: the statement that rules are of "general application," ignoring section 2(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act that rules may be "of particular applicability"; the statement making "rules" broader than "regulations," since regulations are only one of three classes under the rules heading, contradicting the statement made elsewhere that rules and regulations "are commonly used interchangeably"; the statement that laxity in publication of rules "no longer holds in most jurisdictions," contradicting other statements indicating that only nine states required publication of rules in 1948; as of 1953 it is not yet true that "most jurisdictions" publish rules.

[48] See the discussion of cases in Davis, *Administrative Law,* pp. 676–717.

At page 611 Book 3 sets forth what is labeled "Section 4 . . . as finally approved by the Congress in the Administrative Procedure Act." What is set forth is not Section 4 but an inaccurate paraphrase. Subsection (a) provides that the subsection "shall not apply to interpretative rules, general statements of policy, rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice." For these words Book 3 substitutes: " . . . the subsection does not apply to rules other than those of substance." The whole category of interpretative rules, including for instance most Treasury regulations under the income tax law, is written out of the exception by the paraphrase.[49]

At page 617 Book 3 says that "rules have the effect of law." The law is that interpretative rules often lack the force of law.[50]

Book 4. This text has gone through three editions, the third published in 1948.[51] At page 552 Book 4 classifies federal administrative tribunals into four categories, the first of which is "The independent administrative courts: the United States Customs Court, the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the Tax Court of the United States, and the Court of Claims. With some exceptions, the members of these bodies are called judges." All members of all four tribunals are called judges, with no exceptions.[52] The Tax Court is probably an administrative tribunal, as the text says, but each of the other three is, as the Supreme Court has said of the Court of Claims, "a court, in fact as well as in name."[53]

At page 557 Book 4 lists eleven provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, three of which seem to me unsupported by the Act: (1) "Hearing officers were required to make the initial decision." This ignores the Act's provision for recommended decisions, which are used in many cases governed by the Act. (2) "Hearing officers were forbidden to consult on any issue except upon notice and opportunity for the parties to participate." The Act does not forbid consultation "on any issue" but "on any fact in issue," and it is quite important that a hearing officer who is not a lawyer may get legal advice and that a hearing officer who is not an engineer may get engineering advice. (3) Book 4 says that one complaint against administrative practices that led to enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act was "that the decision was based in part on evidence secured subsequent to the hearing." On this point the author says of the Act: "The transcript of testimony and exhibits and all papers filed in the proceeding were made the exclusive record for decision." The author fails to note that because the Act expressly permits official notice—the use of extra-record information—the Act has probably brought about no substantial change concerning the complaint about use of evidence secured subsequent to the hearing.

---

[49] Interpretative rules are explained, *ibid.*, pp. 194–226.

[50] E.g., *10 East Fortieth St. Bldg., Inc.* v. *Callus*, 325 U.S. 578 (1945).

[51] In addition to errors discussed above, the following seem especially important: differentiation of "rule" from "regulation" thereby departing from courts' usage, confusing students who may misunderstand the vocabulary of lawyers and courts, and departing from section 2(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act; classification of agencies into four categories, the last three of which seriously overlap—the Packers and Stockyards Administration, for instance, falls into all of the last three categories; most regulatory agencies are licensing authorities and many are within government departments; statement that apart from constitutional bodies, agencies cannot punish for contempt, whereas statutes in eleven states confer such power, and have been upheld in at least five. (See Davis, *Administrative Law*, p. 123.)

[52] A quick glance at the reports of decisions of these courts will show this.

[53] *Williams* v. *United States*, 289 U.S. 553, 565 (1933). The Court held in *Ex parte Bakelite Corp.*, 279 U.S. 438, 458 (1929) that the Court of Customs Appeals is a court. The Judicial Code provides that the term "court of the United States" includes the Supreme Court, courts of appeals, district courts, the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the Customs Court "and any court created by Act of Congress the judges of which are entitled to hold office during good behavior." 28 *U.S.C.* §451 (1949). The Tax Court judges hold office for twelve years. The statute provides that the Tax Court is "in the Executive Branch of the Government." 26 *U.S.C.* §1100 (1946).

On the subject of certiorari, Book 4 says: "The writ is not widely used in the Federal government as a means of direct review by the Supreme Court of decisions of administrative agencies, although it is available in a growing number of cases." The writ has never been used as a means of direct review by the Supreme Court of an agency decision; the case must first go to a lower court. Since 1913 the writ is not used to review administrative action in the federal courts; it is not used in a growing number of federal cases.[54]

At page 582, in listing Administrative Procedure Act reasons for setting aside administrative action, Book 4 fails to note that the Act's important "except" clause qualifies every item on the list: "Except so far as (1) statutes preclude judicial review or (2) agency action is by law committed to agency discretion. . . . " Because of omission of the "except" clause, the truth is quite different from what appears in the list.

General comments about misinformation. The conclusion seems abundantly supported that political science students have been learning a great deal that is not so about administrative law. How much does it matter?

In some respects, it matters very little. For even if all the misinformation were replaced by information, the students would still have something of only slight educational value. Memorizing and forgetting inaccurate summaries of legal complexities is as good mental exercise as memorizing and forgetting accurate summaries.

In other respects, the extent of the misinformation is important. If the textwriters cannot properly handle this material, what are the teachers likely to do? For instance, when a text says that a rate-fixing case is "really judicial," although the courts call it legislative, can a typical instructor be expected to deal adequately with a student's question about the conclusion stated in the text? Unless the instructor has greater understanding than that of the textwriter, either the educational process will be demoralized for the alert student or the instructor will be reduced to a monitor supervising memory work concerning words and ideas that are only partially understandable to those who are doing the memorizing.

---

[54] See Davis, *Administrative Law*, pp. 778–79.

My purpose is still constructive. The extent of the misinformation in the texts supports my belief that the texts should deal more intensively with smaller areas, that the central inquiry should be why and not what, and that the emphasis should be upon principles about governmental processes and not upon legal technicalities.

V. SUBJECT MATTER

Mr. Justice Jackson has recently declared in a formal opinion: "The rise of administrative bodies probably has been the most significant legal trend of the last century and perhaps more values today are affected by their decisions than by those of all the courts, review of administrative decisions apart."[55] Legal education has successfully kept pace with the revolutionary development of government intervention in economic life. Twenty years ago, the only instruction in administrative law was limited to a few seminars in a handful of leading law schools. Today not only do nearly all law schools provide instruction in administrative law but the course is required at most of the leading schools.

Political science instruction may be lagging to the extent that the regulatory process is a central feature of governmental activities but not of instruction. The texts on public administration are typically devoted four-fifths to such problems as agency organization, personnel management, fiscal planning, and other internal management, and one-fifth or less to the methods by which the agencies carry out the tasks for which they have been created. The focus of the texts on government and business is primarily upon substantive programs rather than upon the governmental processes of regulation. Such courses as are offered on administrative law are usually sparsely populated, mostly with graduate students. I think that much more attention should be given to the regulatory process.

Perhaps one of the reasons for inadequate recognition of the regulatory process in political science instruction is the lack of success of the efforts to provide such instruction. If so, perhaps a major reason for the lack of success is the tendency of political scientists to treat the wrong kind of administrative law for students of political science. In this general area, law and political science overlap, and the area of overlap is probably appropriate for instruction in both law and political science. But some subject matter may be the exclusive province of the political scientist and other subject matter the exclusive province of the lawyer. I think the texts have failed to discriminate adequately between the principles of government that should be the concern of the political scientist and the kind of legal technicalities that are unlikely to be understood by students who lack a substantial background of study of law. Even though I cannot draw a clear line between technical law and political science, and even though any attempt to locate such a line is likely to lead to substantial difference of opinion, I am still of the opinion that some problems should be considered beyond the proper scope of political science instruction: e.g., at what stage of administrative action judicial review should be sought,[56] whether the right remedy is certiorari or mandamus or injunction, and whether or not res judicata may prevent a second consideration of the same issues.

---

[55] *FTC* v. *Ruberoid Co.*, 343 U.S. 470, 487 (1952).

For an illustration in support of my view, let us turn to a textbook-casebook, second edition 1950, which I shall call Book 5. At the beginning of a new chapter, page 719, is a statement of "five principal propositions," the first two of which are: "1. The doctrine of 'prior resort,' 'primary jurisdiction,' or 'exclusive administrative jurisdiction': 'the necessity of resort to the administrative tribunal prior to going to the courts for relief in the event of controversies falling within the general area of the tribunal's statutory powers.' . . . 2. The 'exhaustion doctrine' proper: 'the necessity of exhausting all the available administrative remedies before turning to the courts for relief'." The student may well stop there and wonder what he has read. Are the various concepts listed in the first proposition different names for the same idea, or are the ideas different? Is the "exhaustion doctrine" something different from all the concepts listed in the first proposition? Instead of answering these questions, Book 5 confuses them further.

At page 724 Book 5 quotes a commentator with apparent approval: "The exclusive jurisdiction idea . . . has none of the flexibility of the primary jurisdiction . . . rule." If primary jurisdiction is more flexible than exclusive jurisdiction, then the two concepts must be different. But if they are different, why are they lumped together in the first proposition? If they are different, wherein do they differ except in flexibility? And if they are different, what is the meaning of the heading at page 721, "Exclusive Primary Administrative Jurisdiction"? And why does the author at page 729 use the term, "exclusive primary jurisdiction"? Nowhere in the volume can one find answers to these questions.

The student who is troubled by all this may console himself by reflecting that, anyhow, whether exclusive jurisdiction and primary jurisdiction are two concepts or one, exhaustion is a separate concept, since it is separately stated in the second proposition. But the author immediately obliterates this difference. The first judicial opinion set forth is one in which the Supreme Court explains its holding by saying that judicial review must be denied "until the prescribed administrative remedy has been exhausted," but this opinion is set forth in the text under the heading "Exclusive Primary Administrative Jurisdiction," even though the next three cases are under the heading "The Exhaustion Doctrine Proper." Why the first case is an "exhaustion" case according to the Supreme Court but not according to the headings in Book 5 does not appear. Furthermore, at pages 728–29 Book 5 says that the Supreme

---

[56] Some political scientists evidently regard this subject as something that can be easily presented to students, but I think they are misguided. The subject is sufficiently difficult that the Supreme Court has been unable to formulate a consistent body of principles. For a discussion of various aspects of the subject, see Davis, *Administrative Law*, pp. 614–63 on exhaustion and ripeness, pp. 676–717 on standing, and pp. 812–67 on nonreviewable action.

Court "cited exhaustion cases to 'buttress' the validity of the exclusive primary jurisdiction statute, and this . . . 'underscores' the 'essential identity, for all practical purposes,' of the two principles." But if these two are identical for all practical purposes, why are the two original propositions two instead of one? Not only does this question remain unanswered, but by now Book 5 seems hopelessly confused.

What is a student expected to do about this kind of confusion? What should an instructor do?

To escape those questions, let us turn a few pages to page 726: "The cases on this subject [exhaustion] are said to fall primarily within the fields of taxation and public-utility regulation." Who says this is not revealed, but he is wrong, whoever he is, for the courts say and hold otherwise.[57]

The technical opinion in *Levers* v. *Anderson*[58] is set forth in full. The case holds that in the special circumstances a motion for a rehearing before the Alcohol Unit of the Treasury Department is not a prerequisite to judicial review. The case was decided in 1945. The Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 takes care of the whole problem of administrative rehearings in a single sentence. Why study the 1945 case, then? The answer may be found in the quotation of a commentator that under the Act "a judicial review may be sought without applying to the agency for rehearing." This must mean that the law of the *Levers* case continues and that the lawyer need not apply for an administrative rehearing before going to court. But on this statement is hung a note which calls "inescapable" another commentator's conclusion that the Administrative Procedure Act "supersedes *Levers* v. *Anderson.*" The author neither recognizes the inconsistency nor makes an effort toward reconciliation.[59]

Where, then, does that leave us on the question whether the lawyer before applying for judicial review of the Alcohol Unit's order must first apply for an administrative rehearing? And why should a student of political science care?

I believe that political science instruction probably should either omit all instruction on technical legal problems of this kind or should supply the background necessary to an understanding of the problems. My reasons for objecting to the system of instruction now dominant are in part the same reasons that a political scientist will give for saying that some advanced courses in political science should not be studied until certain elementary courses have been taken. In addition, the students are unlikely to understand materials that the textwriters and the instructors have not first understood. Altogether too prevalent in the teaching materials are summaries of what appears on the surface—summaries that are prepared by textwriters who themselves do not go below the surface. The educational result of such teaching materials is likely to be positively harmful.

---

[57] The exhaustion requirement is one of general application, as even the six cases set forth in Book 5 clearly show. Those six cases involved labor relations, a building permit, immigration, an alcohol license, a tax, and a rate order.

The text presents *Myers* v. *Bethlehem S. Corp.*, 303 U.S. 41 (1938) as though its doctrine were unqualified. The Supreme Court in slightly different circumstances often holds the opposite, as in *Public Util. Comm.* v. *United Fuel Gas Co.*, 317 U.S. 456 (1943). No mention is made of such outstanding cases as *Aircraft & Diesel* v. *Hirsch*, 331 U.S. 752 (1947); *Lichter* v. *United States*, 334 U.S. 742 (1948).

[58] 326 U.S. 219 (1945).

[59] I am the commentator whose conclusion that the Administrative Procedure Act "supersedes *Levers* v. *Anderson*" is said to be "inescapable." But in the article cited for this, "Administrative Law Doctrines of Exhaustion of Remedies, Ripeness for Review, and Primary Jurisdiction," *Texas Law Review*, Vol. 28, pp. 187–93 (1949), no such position is taken. The closest approach is a statement (p. 191) that "The Supreme Court's effort to distinguish between a meaningful rehearing and the mere formality of applying for a rehearing has been swept away by the APA."

The choice should be, in my opinion, between omitting all instruction on technical legal doctrines and providing a rather intensive instruction on the particular doctrines that are covered. A full inquiry that reaches a deep enough level can of course be rewarding.

In making that choice, an independent reason in favor of omitting the most technical legal doctrines from political science instruction is the need for a more adequate treatment of the problems of government concerning the regulatory process. Some of the most vital political science aspects of the regulatory process are now neglected almost altogether.

For example, the problem of the combination of prosecuting and judging—of internal separation of functions versus the kind of complete separation that would create two agencies out of one agency—is essentially a problem of political science, because it is a problem of organization that governmental administrators have to deal with. Only obliquely is the problem one for lawyers; practitioners seldom deal with it in representing clients, because the courts have traditionally held that no relief is available on account of this combination of functions. The history of the National Labor Relations Board throws a good deal of light on the central problem, especially the experiment in complete separation under the Taft-Hartley Act. But I do not find either in the public administration texts or in other political science literature helpful studies of this problem. In a sixty-page chapter I have written on this problem, the principal reference to the literature of political science is to the report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management, whose views are dismissed as "naive" because the report failed to reach the central issue.[60]

Why have not political scientists taken the leadership in trying to provide solutions to the problem of combination of functions? Anyone who studies the regulatory process imaginatively will find hosts of problems of this kind whose solution calls for the skills and the background of political scientists. Samples of additional such problems are suggested in the following section.

VI. SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR RESEARCH

The area most in need of original research is the one that has been most neglected—the political science aspects of the regulatory process. The opportunities in this area are quite unusual, for continuing darkness covers some of the most fundamental problems. Although the lawyers have been working in this area rather intensively, their emphasis is upon the safeguarding of private rights. The need is for studies designed to provide an empirical basis for increasing administrative effectiveness in accomplishing the objectives of regulatory legislation.

---

[60] Davis, *Administrative Law*, p. 389. The central problem is whether or not an internal separation of functions can be satisfactory. The President's Committee did not discuss such internal separation.

To what extent are legislative choices nullified by administrative failures? To what extent do the regulated groups control the regulators? To what extent, if at all, do regulatory agencies effectively represent an otherwise unprotected public interest? How can the regulatory process be made more successful—or less unsuccessful—in carrying out the will of the people's representatives?

Questions like these can be answered only by detailed investigation of experience. Instead of studying further such overworked subjects as judicial review of administrative action, we need to learn more about the regulatory process itself, its internal arrangements and methods, and its external relations—with Congress, with congressional committees, with individual congressmen, with the President, with executive departments, with independent agencies, with lobbyists, with regulated interests, with protected interests.

To show what I have in mind, I shall list some *samples* of specific questions about internal processes and about relations of agencies with regulated and protected groups:

What are the effects upon administrative policies of conducting general investigations of the broad problems that lie behind masses of small adjudications, as compared with the prevalent system of separately treating each problem in each adjudication? Are agencies often deficient in failing to make early use of formal rules to fill the gaps left in policies declared through adjudication? What are the potentialities of a greater interaction between rule making and adjudication, and of a broader and perhaps more democratic participation of affected parties by enlarging the role of policy making through rules and restricting the role of policy making through adjudication?

What are the effects upon administrative policies of granting to or withholding from private parties the right to compel prosecutions? Should private parties have the right to institute prosecutions for unfair trade practices and for unfair labor practices?

What are the effects upon administrative policies of greater autonomy in professional staffs, increased subdelegation, more decentralization, heavier reliance on methods of informal supervision as compared with methods of formal adjudication and formal rule making, comprehensive and periodic clarification of enforcement or prosecution policies as against ad hoc development of enforcement or prosecution policies from case to case, confidential settlement of cases as compared with public reporting of all consent orders and all agreements on which consent orders rest?

What are the unrealized potentialities of administrative advisory opinions? Could the Federal Trade Commission, for example, increase its effectiveness by imitating the Securities and Exchange Commission's method of using advisory opinions, at least for a considerable portion of the Trade Commission's work? What proportion of Trade Commission prosecutions results from lack of prior clarification of law and policy, and what proportion could be obviated by formal rules or by advisory opinions? Should action be taken to induce the agencies to make more effective use of the declaratory-order power granted by the Administrative Procedure Act?

What in fact are the mechanics of lobbying before particular regulatory agencies, what are the successes and failures of the lobbying forces, what are the losses of the groups that are under-represented in these processes, and what institutional arrangements are indicated for more faithful reflection of legislative choices? In what circumstances are lobbying objectives lost before legislative bodies but won before administrative bodies, and with what consequences? What are the private organizations that engage in administrative lobbying in each field of regulation, what are the countervailing forces, what has been the experience with offsetting devices such as consumers' counsel and small-business representation, and what alternative devices might be more effective?

More specifically, what are the informal contacts between Civil Aeronautics Board members and the representatives of scheduled airlines? Wherein do the relations of nonscheduled airlines with Board members differ, why have the differences developed, and what is their significance? Apart from formal proceedings, what are the practices of airline executives and their counsel for gaining the favor of CAB members? What are the detailed relations between the Association of American Railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission? To what extent are the most significant policies made by the AAR, with ICC ratification? Is the influence of shippers' organizations and of motor carrier organizations less powerful than that of the AAR, and if so, why, and what governmental arrangements are needed to maintain a proper balance? Has the Securities and Exchange Commission lost some of its former aggressiveness, and what have been the specific influences of the regulated interests? Why has the Federal Communications Commission failed to enforce the policies announced in its "bluebook"? What are the methods used by major oil companies, notably the Phillips Petroleum Company, in controlling policies of the Federal Power Commission with respect to certain natural gas rates, how successful are those methods, what are the countervailing forces, and by what means can and should a proper balance be maintained? Can and should the groups whose interests the legislation is designed to protect somehow be made more influential in the pull and haul of policy formulation?

From the standpoint of effective accomplishment of legislative objectives, what does experience show concerning advantages and disadvantages of independence of agencies and of subordination of agencies to cabinet officers? What have been the specific effects of such independence or subordination upon administrative lobbying concerning particular issues? Is an independent agency more vulnerable or less vulnerable than an agency in an executive department to the pressures of the regulated groups? What are the effects of independence of an agency upon pressures by the protected groups?[61] What are the effects upon these questions of presidential support of, opposition to, or indifference to regulatory policies of the agency? What are the limits of regulatory policies which the regulated groups strongly oppose, when the regulatory policies have varying degrees of support by public opinion, by Congress, and by the President?

To what extent do policies of regulatory agencies reflect the relative political power of competing groups, and to what extent do independent professional

---

[61] Many political scientists may regard David B. Truman's *The Governmental Process* (New York, 1951) as an adequate answer to some of these questions. This book seems to me to be of outstanding excellence, but I do not see how important governmental planning could be based upon its conclusions concerning pressures on regulatory agencies. Vagueness and generality rob the basic observations of precision and reliability. Statements that are largely or mostly true are too often partly false. See for instance the following:

"Experience indicates . . . that the regulated groups will have more cohesion than those demanding regulation" (p. 418). The groups regulated by the NLRB from 1935 to 1947 were employers; did not those demanding regulation, the unions, have greater cohesion? Under the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, do not those demanding regulation, the railroads, have greater cohesion than the regulated? Do not scheduled airlines, which demand regulation of the non-scheduled lines, have greater cohesion?

"The significant difference between an 'independent' agency and one clearly part of the executive branch is that the latter may somewhat more readily reflect the relative standing of the organized and unorganized interests responsible for the passage of a statute" (p. 419). What does this mean? Does it mean that an agency in the executive branch more accurately reflects relative strength of competing groups than an independent agency? Does not a valid observation on this subject have to take into account the President's attitudes toward the regulatory program? What is the evidence, and what are the exceptions? Does the statement rest upon specific experience, or is it largely a guess?

"A commission formally independent of the chief executive and expected to assume the detachment of a judicial body is more likely to be primarily accessible to the organized elements among the regulated than is an agency in the executive branch" (p. 420). Does the statement mean that judicial detachment makes an agency more accessible to the organized elements among the regulated? Does not a court's judicial detachment make it less accessible? On the question whether an independent agency is more accessible to organized elements among the regulated than an agency in the executive branch, does not the answer depend upon agreement or disagreement between presidential policies and the positions of the organized elements among the regulated?

"A regulatory agency normally cannot operate a controversial statute effectively without the support of the chief executive" (p. 420). Is the Interstate Commerce Act a controversial statute? Did the ICC operate effectively without the support of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman? Is the Federal Trade Commission Act controversial; did the two Presidents support the Commission; and did the Commission operate effectively? Should the generalization command confidence in absence of more specific information?

"The political survival of an independent commission depends upon its reaching a modus vivendi with the regulated" (p. 420). Does this mean that the agency must satisfy the principal demands of the regulated? If so, what of the NLRB from 1935 until 1947? What of the SEC for perhaps a half dozen years after 1933?

"Because other interests may have a larger voice in the arrangements made by an executive agency, 'independence' for the regulators has a defensive advantage for the judgments of administrators and administrative staffs counteract political pressures? To what extent do political influences override such professional judgments, and in what circumstances, if any, should the professional judgments be insulated against such overriding? To what extent do administrators develop excessive independence in resolving issues that ought to be resolved through compromise of political pressures, and what are the practical consequences?

What are the activities of individual congressmen, representing constituents or otherwise, in influencing administrative policies, what are the improprieties, what should be the limits, and what, if any, controls can be provided? What does experience show concerning use and misuse of the power of appropriation to control administrative policies? What are the processes by which regulatory policies are worked out through cooperative arrangements with congressional committees, with other parts of the executive branch, and with affected private interests, and what are the practical consequences?

Most of these questions, as well as other similar questions, are either unanswered in the existing literature of public administration or are answered only in vague or general terms. The pressing need is for extensive and intensive factual studies of administrative policy making—studies that will emphasize concrete, detailed, and practical facts and will postpone generalization, theory, and abstraction until adequate factual foundations have been laid.

---

regulated" (p. 420). Does this mean that interests other than the regulated interests may have a larger voice in the executive agency than in the independent agency? If so, are the President's views immaterial? What of the NLRB from 1935 to 1947 when the "other interests" were the unions? Do buyers of meat have a larger voice in the policies of the Packers and Stockyards Administration than buyers of natural gas have in the policies of the FPC? If so, is it because of FPC independence? What is the evidence?

"Once a set of relationships between regulated and regulators has been established, the resources of 'independence' will be fully employed to defend the existing regulatory pattern against disturbance or disruption" (p. 421). Was a set of relationships established between the NLRB and regulated employers between 1935 and 1947, and did the employers "defend the existing regulatory pattern"? Did the SEC in its first few years establish such a set of relationships, and did the regulated defend them?

COLLECTIVE SECURITY REEXAMINED

KENNETH W. THOMPSON
Northwestern University

From one standpoint it is a truism to say that collective security is something new under the sun. In past eras and especially in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, war was conceived of as a duel in which contestants should be isolated and restrained by the rest of international society. When nations engaged in armed conflict their neighbors sought to localize the struggle and alleviate its poisonous effects. However short-sighted their actions in not meeting the conflict directly and turning back aggression at its source, the nations pursuing these policies were sometimes successful for varying periods of time in preserving islands of peace in a warring world.

On August 8, 1932, however, Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson proclaimed the revolutionary fact that the modern state system was entering a new era in which warring powers were no longer entitled to the same equally impartial and neutral treatment by the rest of society. He announced to the New York Council of Foreign Relations that in future conflicts one or more of the combatants must be designated as wrong-doer and added: "We no longer draw a circle about them and treat them with the punctilios of the duelist's code. Instead we denounce them as lawbreakers."[1]

This is the cornerstone of the universally recognized theory of collective security to which most Western statesmen profess loyalty today. It is said that Mr. Stimson's memoirs, *On Active Service*, have become the "bible" of the Department of State, and in Britain we have the word of *The Times* (London) in a recent editorial that collective security " . . . indeed, is the view to which this country, like most others, is committed by its membership in the United Nations. . . . "[2]

How are we to account for this new form of international relations? Perhaps there are three keys to the radical transformation of Western thought and the more modest shift in Western practice. Approached in imaginary and figurative terms, collective security may be said to have found its soul in the revolution in beliefs, its body in the revolution in techniques, and its mind in the revolution in contemporary international institutions taking place in the last three-quarters of a century. The soul of collective security has been formed by the growth of practical morality. The chief characteristic of social behavior in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century has been the increasing attention paid to all forms of humanitarian projects. In medieval society the thought of eliminating war or poverty was rarely given serious attention. War and poverty were conceived of as abiding moral problems and defects and flaws in a universal moral order. So long as man continued in his present state and society could not be fundamentally transformed, war would never be eradicated. This philosophy, as well as the theological concepts undergirding it, was swept away by the Age of the Enlightenment. In its place the West seemed to accept the creed of democratic liberalism with its aim of abolishing all ills and diseases disturbing the body social. Voltaire in his pleadings for condemned men, Bentham in his views on prison reforms, and the various programs for the elimination or outlawry of war reflected the new spirit. War became a practical problem in social engineering. The belief in one moral universe had been shattered; the belief in one world community demanding a multitude of social and institutional reforms took its place.

---

[1] Henry L. Stimson and McGeorge Bundy, *On Active Service in Peace and War* (New York, 1947), p. 259.

[2] Editorial, "Cross Purposes," *The Times* (London), Feb. 5, 1952, p. 5.

Another contemporary change of unparalleled importance has been the revolution in techniques and economics. If one excludes the force of contemporary nationalism, the overwhelmingly most powerful force in producing revolutionary changes in both East and West has been industrialization. The consequences which follow from the shrinking of a large-scale atlas into a small-scale globe can be attributed largely to industrialism. Economically, it is obvious that the world is one world wherein ideally the activities and production of each part must be geared and meshed with the functions of all the others. Industrialism for historians like Arnold J. Toynbee displays the force of a massive oecumenical movement drawing the world together. Technological change, which progressed slowly enough for eighteen centuries, has suddenly exploded. Within our present century the change has been so staggering, the rate so accelerated that few fully comprehend and appreciate its scope. For eighteen centuries, ten miles an hour was the maximum speed of travel on sea and sometimes on land. In 1790 four days were required to travel the two hundred miles from Boston to New York. Today the same time permits travellers to circle the globe. The earth today is smaller and is more intricately and profoundly interdependent than the thirteen original states, and in consequence the technological basis for Wendell Willkie's one world is said to exist.

Since the technological basis of a single world is at hand, it is only logical that for many a single government should be indicated. The revolution in techniques and the transformation of beliefs have called for new institutions to enable the development of the mind of the West to keep pace with the growth of its body and soul. It was said that the interdependent and socially self-conscious international society lacked only rational controls and organization. It was shown that we suffer from a profound cultural lag. It was argued that for nations to act in concert solely when their immediate interests in survival are at stake is not enough. The mind, the body and the soul of modern society have called for a universal system of collective security heralded as the final essential step in repudiating great power conflicts and in guaranteeing perpetual peace.

THE IDEA OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

It is important that we ask at the outset, then: What is collective security in theory? What are its precepts and main tenets? What, in simplest terms, is the philosophy of collective security? The rock bottom principle upon which collective security is founded provides that an attack on any one state will be regarded as an attack on all states. It finds its measure in the simple doctrine of one for all and all for one. War anywhere, in the context of Article 11 of the League of Nations, is the concern of every state.

Self-help and neutrality, it should be obvious, are the exact antithesis of such a theory. States under an order of neutrality are impartial when conflict breaks out, give their blessings to combatants to fight it out, and defer judgment regarding the justice or injustice of the cause involved. Self-help in the past was often "help yourself" so far as the great powers were concerned; they enforced their own rights and more besides. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries this system was fashionable and wars, although not eliminated, were localized whenever possible. In a more integrated world environment, a conflict anywhere has some effect on conditions of peace everywhere. A disturbance at one point upsets the equilibrium at all other points, and the adjustment of a single conflict restores the foundations of harmony at other points throughout the world.

This idea of collective security is simple, challenging and novel. It would do for the international society what police action does for the domestic community. If the individual is threatened or endangered in municipal society, he turns to the legitimate agents of law enforcement, the police. The comparatively successful operation of this system has meant relative peace and tolerable harmony for most local communities. Through the action of police or "fire brigades" on a world scale, collective security has as its goal two comparable objectives. It would *prevent* war by providing a deterrent to aggression. It would *defend* the interests of peace-loving states in war if it came, by concentrating a preponderance of power against the aggressor. These two ends have been the goals of both the League and the United Nations. Through power and persuasion, a collective system would seek to deter aggression, as in the case of the Soviet imperialist threat to Titoist Yugoslavia. A potential aggressor must know that Yugoslavia and other United Nations powers stand together under the same protective umbrella. If war comes, the security system by pooling resources defends its interests against any nation which threatens to undermine it by swallowing up one of its members.

The ideal of collective security nowhere has been taken more seriously than among responsible leaders in the United States. More than the other political leaders accountable for the conduct of their nations' policies during and following World War I, Woodrow Wilson assumed that national interests were rapidly being supplanted by the common enlightened purposes of mankind everywhere and, particularly at the outset of the peace talks, sought to act upon his convictions. But the moral and political foundations required for collective action vanished with the cessation of hostilities and Wilson himself was forced to turn from his principles. He was driven to accept postwar territorial settlements in the Balkans that were at best half-hearted compromises with the crusade he had led. The tragic march of events of the "Twenty Years' Crisis" following 1919, however, revived the flame of belief in the hearts of other American political leaders that better forms for the conduct of international relations must be discovered and instituted. An uneasy conscience over America's departure from collective security after World War I—when the Senate defeated the Covenant of the League of Nations—coupled with a more skillful marshalling of opinion in support of the United Nations, inspired internationalist and isolationist senators to join hands in support of the same principle after World War II.

In his first speech to the Senate, Harry S. Truman of Missouri declared: "The breaking of the peace anywhere is the concern of peace-loving nations everywhere."[3] Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg announced following the San Francisco Conference in a dramatic speech to the Senate that he would support the ratification of the Charter with all the resources at his command. For, he explained: "peace must not be cheated of its collective chance. . . . We must have collective security to stop the next war, if possible, before it starts; and we must have collective action to crush it swiftly if it starts in spite of our organized precautions."[4] Thus, the American President whose course in foreign policy was to be charted boldly and unambiguously according to the abstract principles of collective security, and the reputed architect of the bipartisan foreign policy were from the beginning unequivocally committed by their words to support of the United Nations.[5]

Indeed, American support for the new method of preserving international peace and order has gone far beyond the ritualism of pious affirmation of an inspiring ideal. Approval for the principles of collective security at the time of World War II was asserted even more eloquently in the actions and policies of its leaders. As a young man Franklin D. Roosevelt had argued against the annexation of Hawaii. For, he maintained: "before we bother about foreign coaling-stations and fortifications we should look to the defense of our own coasts." New York, Boston, and San Francisco were still at the mercy of an enemy, and rather than prepare far-reaching security plans, the United States ought to concentrate on its own national defenses. In his concrete policies, however, President Roosevelt rejected this youthful counsel. In the late nineteen thirties, it became obvious that American interests could be protected only if other nations were secure, and the Roosevelt foreign policy became one of collective self-help. "Suppose my neighbor's home catches fire, and I have a length of garden hose. . . . ," he remarked, in justifying Lend-Lease to the Senate and the American people.[6] This neighborly analogy was a practical way of convincing the people that their security was intimately bound up with Britain in its struggle for survival.

---

[3] Cyril Clemens, *The Man from Missouri* (Webster Groves, Missouri: International Mark Twain Society, 1945), p. 150.

[4] *The Private Papers of Senator Vandenberg*, ed. Arthur H. Vandenberg, Jr. (Boston, 1952), p. 217.

[5] In his speech to the Senate asking ratification of the Charter, President Truman declared: "This Charter points down the only road to enduring peace. There is no other." Clemens, *The Man from Missouri*, p. 172.

[6] Robert E. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, 2 vols. (New York, 1950), Vol. 1, p. 276.

To symbolize the collective effort involved in the conduct of World War II, the Grand Alliance was referred to as the Military United Nations, on which the Constitutional and Political United Nations was to be based. In June of 1950, President Truman enlisted American manpower and resources in a struggle which all responsible authorities agreed involved the survival of the United Nations and not the protection of American vital interests. Thus not only by words but more emphatically by policies and actions, recent American leaders have boldly approved and faithfully supported the ideal of collective security.

THE REAL ISSUE OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

This simple picture of the idea of collective security hardly furnishes a useful and realistic perspective on the way such a system operates in practice today. Nor are we helped by comparing the structure of the two historic experiments in collective security. The formal agencies for collective security after World War I were in several important respects unimpressive. Article 16 of the Covenant provided that any member resorting to war contrary to the Covenant had committed *ipso facto* an act of aggression against all other members. It was intended that first economic measures and then overt force should be applied against any offender. But although the international obligations of members were less ambiguous than in the Charter, there was no clear provision for their implementation or organization by a central enforcement agency. Each nation had full freedom to provide what troops it saw fit. The Council could then advise on additional measures. In contrast, Article 39 of the Charter of the United Nations commissions the Security Council to determine the existence of a threat to the peace or act of aggression and Articles 43–47 obligate the members, upon the completion of agreements, to supply troops to the Military Staff Committee. The agencies for partial collective security, as found in the constitutional provisions of the North Atlantic Pact and the practical steps undertaken under NATO, are even more impressive and formidable today.

From the beginning, however, the real issue concerning collective security has had little to do with charters or compacts. The real issue has been the question of why the implementation of a system logically so flawless, and enjoying such impressive official devotion and popular support, should have been accompanied by a period of virtually unprecedented collective insecurity. It is a sobering fact that the nineteenth century was perhaps the most peaceful of modern centuries; the twentieth, by contrast, has been an epoch of unparalleled bloodshed. From 1815 to 1914 a system of old-fashioned balance of power contributed to the achievement of nearly a full century of uninterrupted peace. The past forty years have witnessed in rapid succession two great wars which the historian Arnold J. Toynbee compares to the double wars of the Romans and the Carthaginians and the two struggles of the Peloponnesian War which wrecked Hellenic Civilization. He has observed that quite possibly we have dealt ourselves the same "knockout blows" that these wars represented for the older civilizations. There were only eighteen months in the nineteenth century when France, Russia, Austria, Prussia, England and Spain found themselves at war with one another (excluding the Crimean War as a colonial struggle). By contrast, our experience thus far with the novel machinery of collective security has hardly warranted the unqualified postwar optimism of men like Mr. Hull that, with the new international organization, power politics and war were being left far behind in our progress toward utopia.

Instead the recent decades have been years of unceasing war or threats of war. What are the causes of this state of affairs? What are the reasons for the enormous gap between the theory and practice, the promise and performance of collective security? The most popular and reassuring answer has been that the radical doctrines of National Socialism and Communism have undermined the ideal system, and that modern technology has shattered the earlier limitations on conflict. Yet an equally dynamic creed challenged peace and order in the nineteenth century and provided a fighting faith for imperialist France.

The serious observer must look more deeply at the substance of political reality. In so doing he will find that collective security yesterday and today has been viewed unrealistically, and that its executors have been asked to perform tasks which could be performed with complete success only if certain objective conditions were realized. The most vital questions regarding collective security have seldom been asked; the real problems have often been evaded. The fundamental issues and problems which should have been boldly and realistically confronted have been concealed and obscured in constitutional verbiage and formal legalistic arguments. The four basic problems responsible for the tragic predicament of collective security include the problem of its basic preconditions, the political problem, the psychological problem and the problem of peaceful change. The first is from one standpoint most basic, for the preconditions of collective security, being frequently misunderstood, have presented the most stubborn obstacle to the maintenance of international peace.

Preconditions of Collective Security. Manifestly, collective enforcement is unattainable in the absence of appropriate international machinery and binding obligations clearly set forth in recognized legal instruments. Yet every informed citizen knows from experience that a legal arrangement imposed upon political and social conditions incompatible with its fulfillment makes successful political action difficult. Therefore it is essential in considering the reality of collective security that we understand fully its assumptions and requirements.

First, collective enforcement assumes a status quo, or situation of peace, on which the nations with predominant strength agree. In practical terms, the peace which a collective system must defend is the territorial status quo existing at the time the system is brought into being. There is nothing in past experience to indicate that all nations, or even a combination sufficiently powerful to defy the rest, will agree on the meaning of a particular status quo. Following every war, the defeated powers who feel they have suffered most by the terms of peace come to oppose the established status quo. In the aftermath of World War II, however, the question of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the status quo has largely been superseded by an earlier and prior question.

Up to the present time, no practical arrangement has been worked out acceptable to the major powers, who in this case are primarily the Soviet Union and the United States, on which the postwar status quo could be founded. The unresolved conflict between East and West has prevented the establishment of peace. Consequently, the latest experiment in collective security presents us with the anomalous picture of a system created to defend a status quo which has not yet been brought into being.

Moreover, the absence of accepted conditions of peace has been interpreted by some as a positive virtue. The wartime Secretary of State Cordell Hull argued that the League had been destroyed on the floor of the American Senate because of its intimate relationship with the Peace Treaty of Versailles.[7] Better to establish a general international organization, he urged, and then, with passions less inflamed, work out a just and reasonable peace. James F. Byrnes, one of Mr. Hull's successors as Secretary of State in the postwar period, said that he was convinced, based upon his studies as a congressman of the proceedings of the Paris Peace Conference, that a "new approach" was essential. The negotiators at Paris had tried to settle too many difficult problems when the spirit of conflict and revenge still dominated their counsels. Mr. Byrnes prescribed a schedule of discussions in which the less controversial treaties, such as the Italian and Balkan settlements, would be negotiated first. Then the negotiators might turn from their initial successes to the more difficult questions of a German and a Japanese settlement. All agreements arrived at in this order would be introduced in the United Nations, where great and minor powers might participate in considering and amending them. In order to prevent the historic division of the nations into opponents and supporters of the postwar status quo, Mr. Byrnes reached the ingenious conclusion that: "We had to devise a system that would facilitate agreement among the major powers and at the same time provide the smaller states with ample opportunities to express their views."[8] The newly created collective organization would intervene directly in the establishment of the postwar status quo.

In retrospect the problem inherent in the "new approach" has become plain for all to see. Its author, Mr. Byrnes, has observed: "It was a good theory. But it was faulty in one assumption."[9] It assumed that the claims of the Soviet Union could be more readily accommodated to the vital interests of the West than has been the case. While this faulty assumption was shared by the majority of those responsible for the conduct of Soviet-American relations, there were at least three prominent leaders who at various times expressed misgivings about the priority accorded the founding of the United Nations. In 1941 President Roosevelt declared that he "would not be in favor of the creation of a new Assembly of the League of Nations, at least until after a period of time had passed . . . ," during which the major powers, and Britain and the United State in particular, had been successful in establishing and maintaining peace.[10]

---

[7] As early as May 11, 1944, a Special Committee on Postwar Plans, composed of Senators Connally, Barkley, George, Gillette (Democrats), La Follette (Progressive), Vandenberg, White and Austin (Republicans), had begun to explore this and other related questions.

[8] James F. Byrnes, *Speaking Frankly* (New York, 1947), p. 70.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson maintained, in opposition to Mr. Byrnes, that the breakdown of peace after World War I was due primarily to the lack of political foundations from which the League of Nations had suffered. He held that " . . . the mistake was made of not securing that guarantee [of French security] before the second step of creating the League of Nations. . . . " was taken.[11] In the preparatory discussions on the United Nations Mr. Stimson accordingly warned: "we should not put the cart before the horse."[12] He urged that attention not be diverted from the paramount need for a settlement among the major powers by too much premature concern over blueprints for world organization. For the international organization would gain power and authority only if outstanding political problems had been adjusted. He advised: "We should by thorough discussion between the three or four great powers endeavor to settle . . . fundamental problems."[13] If a general settlement based on mutual guarantees could be worked out, the new instruments of international organization would stand on more viable foundations.

A third distinguished American statesman supported the views of Secretary Stimson. In the Senate debate in 1944 on postwar plans, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg insisted that the United States must not subscribe to collective security " . . . until we know more about what the new status quo will be. It is my argument that we should go ahead and perfect a plan for collective security; but that we should make it wholly contingent . . . the new 'league' must be *contingent* upon the *character* of the *peace*."[14]

Second, collective security demands that nations subscribing to the status quo be willing and able at all times to muster overwhelming strength for collective defense at successive points of conflict. In theory, the supporters of the status quo might be capable in particular emergencies of mobilizing effective and decisive power against the single aggressor who sought to defy them. Or, by pooling the resources of all the nations in a permanently organized international force, collective enforcement could be made automatic, instantaneous, and preponderant. The former condition, however, is practically impossible of fulfillment, inasmuch as the threat to the status quo comes historically from more than one dissatisfied power or aggressor. The second condition would call for the unprecedented practice of international contingents operating under an international agency empowered to decide conclusively when and how they should be used.

---

[10] Quoted in Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, Vol. 1, p. 436. Mr. Churchill asked if this would not antagonize the extreme internationalists, but Mr. Roosevelt replied that the time had come to be realistic and that this group was almost entirely lacking in realism.

[11] Stimson, *On Active Service*, p. 603.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 604.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] Vandenberg, *Private Papers*, p. 96.

The United Nations Charter seems to take a long step toward this objective by providing that all members are "to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance and facilities. . . . " (Article 43, Paragraph 1.) Through this provision, the incurable weakness of decentralized enforcement by which past international systems have been rendered impotent is ostensibly rectified. For the Achilles' heel of the earlier experiments was the decentralized character of the enforcement process; separate nations retained the right to determine whether or not military forces would be made available to meet particular crises. In 1942, Cordell Hull had urged that "some international agency must be created which can—by force, if necessary—keep the peace. . . . "[15] Yet Mr. Hull's proposition and Articles 43ff of the Charter, by which this historic difficulty apparently had been surmounted, in practice have remained a dead letter. No special agreements have been concluded by Members with the Security Council; talks in the Military Staff Committee soon reached an impasse. The Soviet Union has opposed proportionate contributions to an international air and naval force, which would leave it particularly vulnerable to forces overwhelmingly more powerful than its own. The United States has been concerned to make the United Nations Armed Force as strong as possible against the military preponderance of the Soviet Army in Europe and Asia, while the Russians have sought to keep it as weak as possible.[16] The stalemate in the Military Staff Committee is fundamentally a symptom of the struggle between the two great powers and between supporters and opponents of the undefined status quo. In practice, the realization of the second condition of overwhelming strength for collective enforcement has constantly run afoul of special national demands for military security and supremacy.

There is a *third* and final prerequisite of collective security, however, to which we now turn, that was widely assumed to be in existence at the time preparations for the United Nations were first being made. It is essential to collective security in a world of unequal powers that at least the major powers enjoy a minimum of political solidarity and moral community. On October 13, 1944, Premier Stalin asked himself, in an article appearing in the Soviet *Information Bulletin*, if the world organization could be effective. He predicted that it would "be effective if the Great Powers, which have borne the brunt of the war against Hitler-Germany continue to act in a spirit of unanimity and accord."[17]

---

[15] 7 Department of State *Bulletin* (1942), p. 645.

[16] It should be noted that the Russians have no monopoly on opposition to a powerful world police force. Senator Vandenberg declares in his Memoirs: "I am opposed to what is generally understood by the term 'international police force.' So, I believe, are the President, Secretary Hull and most realistic students of this problem. To be adequate, an international police force would have to be larger than the regular army and navy of any other power on earth. I think it is fantastic to believe that the people would long consent to the maintenance of any such enormous concentration of power in the postwar peace; and I also think that the temptation to reach for its ultimate control could become the greatest possible threat to peace in years to come." Vandenberg, *Private Papers*, pp. 120–21.

[17] USSR *Information Bulletin*, Oct. 13, 1944.

The effectiveness of the United Nations and of the Security Council in particular was predicated upon the unanimity of the five great powers. It was an article of political faith in the Roosevelt Administration that trustworthiness and good will on the part of Americans would inspire the same qualities among the Russians. In a particularly revealing memorandum for President Harry S. Truman dated September 11, 1945, Mr. Stimson explained: "The chief lesson I have learned in a long life is that the only way you can make a man trustworthy is to trust him; and the surest way to make him untrustworthy is to distrust him and show your distrust."[18] Unanimity among the great powers which alien ideologies and conflicting interests might otherwise undermine would be secured through the application of a code of social ethics that had in general been effective within the United States.[19]

By October of 1947, Mr. Stimson, writing in *Foreign Affairs*, had cause to reformulate his proposition and to say: "I have often said that the surest way to make a man trustworthy is to trust him. But I must add that this does not always apply to a man who is determined to make you his dupe. Before we can make friends with the Russians, their leaders will have to be convinced that they have nothing to gain, and everything to lose, by acting on the assumption that our society is dying and that our principles are outworn."[20] Thus the preconditions of collective security under the United Nations have either been wanting from the beginning, or have been corroded and destroyed by the all-consuming forces of the "cold war."

The Political Problem. The chief practical obstacle to collective security is the political problem deriving from the conflict of independent foreign policies. The loyalties and interests of nations participating in international organizations and collective security systems are of a different order from those of individuals taking part in the more intimate communities of the family and nation.[21] Both individuals and nations pursue their own interests, but in some areas and on certain occasions the individual may forsake his egotistic motives for loyalty to some higher institution or nobler cause. There are institutions in integrated societies which provide common standards under which the individual can realize his aspirations. There need be no inherent conflict between an individual's private interests and his national loyalties, for the latter can often promote the realization of the former. On the other hand, conflicts are often inevitable between national and supranational loyalties, and when the projected policy of an international organization conflicts with that of a particular nation, at all times and in all places the national interest prevails.

---

[18] Stimson, *On Active Service*, p. 644.

[19] It remained, however, for Premier Stalin in conversation with Harry Hopkins to furnish unwittingly the key to the success or failure of this endeavor. He declared that trust and confidence in international as in national relations is dependent upon the existence of ". . . a minimum moral standard between all nations and without such a minimum moral standard nations could not exist." Premier Stalin continued that the leaders of Nazi Germany "knew no such minimum moral standard [but] . . . without a second's thought would sign a treaty today, break it tomorrow and sign a second one the following day. Nations must fulfill their treaty obligations, he said, or international society could not exist." Nor, it might be added, could collective security survive. Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, Vol. 1, pp. 399–400.

[20] Stimson, *On Active Service*, pp. 649–50.

[21] Some years ago Monsieur Paul Henri Spaak in an address before the Foreign Press Union declared: "There must be a hierarchy in international obligations. The nations of the continent cannot be asked to consider with the same realism and sincerity of judgment affairs which directly concern them and events which are taking place thousands of kilometres away in regions where they have neither interests nor influence. Indivisible peace, mutual assistance, and even collective security are general ideas whose practical effect must be clearly explained and clearly limited." Quoted in *Survey of International Affairs, 1936* (London, 1937), pp. 354–55.

In the debate between the so-called realists and idealists,[22] the latter have often assumed that the conflict between national and supranational policies and purposes need not take the form the realists give it. Idealists have maintained that if two sets of objectives should be in conflict, the clash could always be resolved by taking "the long view." It should not be surprising that statesmen have been more disposed to approach the foreign policies of *other* nations with this as their "rule of thumb." For example, on January 10, 1945, in his momentous speech to the American Senate, Arthur H. Vandenberg assessed the objectives of the Soviet Union. He announced that the Soviet leaders appeared to contemplate the engulfment, directly or indirectly, of a surrounding circle of states on the Russian borders. Their defense of this sphere of influence policy was on grounds of security against German aggression. While finding this a perfectly understandable claim, Senator Vandenberg observed: "The alternative is collective security. . . . Which is better in the long view, from a purely selfish Russian standpoint: To forcefully surround herself with a cordon of unwillingly controlled or partitioned states, thus affronting the opinion of mankind . . . or to win the priceless asset of world-confidence in her by embracing the alternative, namely, full and whole hearted cooperation with and reliance upon a vital international organization."[23]

Yet Senator Vandenberg and other American statesmen, while raising this standard for others, have by their actions and not infrequently their words appealed to another less lofty if more attainable political goal. Not all of our leaders have been as transparently candid as Senator Vandenberg in expressing the hope "that American spokesmanship at the peace table is at least as loyal to America's own primary interests as Mr. Stalin is certain to be in respect to Russian and Mr. Churchill . . . to the British Empire."[24] Yet in his warning, the Senator appeared to employ a new "rule of thumb" based on the precept "that no one is going to look out for us . . . unless we look out for ourselves. . . ."[25]

---

[22] Hans J. Morgenthau, "Another 'Great Debate': The National Interest of the United States," this REVIEW, Vol. 46, pp. 961–88 (Dec., 1952); Herbert W. Briggs, "New Dimensions in International Law," this REVIEW, Vol. 46, pp. 677–98 (Sept., 1952); and Kenneth W. Thompson, "The Study of International Politics," *The Review of Politics*, Vol. 14, pp. 433–67 (Oct., 1952). The conflict between national and supranational objectives is illustrated in the present Korean dilemma. South Korea's interests since 1950 were identical with those of the United Nations, but with the approach of an armistice this identity of interests has disappeared.

[23] Vandenberg, *Private Papers*, p. 136. Five months later on June 14, 1945, the Michigan Senator conceded: "I agree that there must be this veto on the use of force" (p. 211).

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

It is true that the ambivalence we have found in Senator Vandenberg's use of guides to action in foreign policy is sometimes accounted for by the role he played in American life. As a onetime arch-isolationist, he could be expected to cling to certain narrow standards and selfish nationalist principles. Yet Theodore and Franklin D. Roosevelt, who can hardly be placed under the same stricture, sensed instinctively the importance of American vital interests in the conduct of foreign policy. Theodore Roosevelt intervened to sustain a balance of power in Europe and Asia by offering American good offices at the Portsmouth Conference and by seeking to moderate the crisis over Morocco at the Conference of Algeciras in 1906. When asked at the time of the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5 why he opposed England, though admiring its democracy, and why he favored Russia, though despising its despotism and mendacity, he replied: "Do you not understand that I am looking after America's interest, that and nothing more. . . . If anyone else views action taken in American interest from the standpoint of a foreign power, I shall be sorry, but it certainly will not alter my own conduct."[26]

The nature of the first Roosevelt's concept of foreign policy may be less surprising than the private admission by Franklin D. Roosevelt that he approached foreign policy on essentially the same basis. In early 1941, when seeking a formula by which aid to Britain could be extended, Franklin Roosevelt received a letter from a well-known advertising man reporting that charges being made by the Nyes and Lindberghs that we were acting in foreign policy to save the British and not ourselves were taking a serious toll. The business man urged Mr. Roosevelt to tell the truth, namely, that we were not concerned primarily with the British Empire as such but with our own safety, the security of our trade, the future of our crops, the integrity of our continent, and the lives of our children in the next generation. The President replied: "That I think, is a pretty good line to take because it happens to be true and it is on that line itself that we must, for all the above purely selfish reasons, prevent at almost any hazard the Axis domination of the world."[27] The American strategy of fighting World War II first on the Atlantic sea lanes and in Europe reflected the priority Mr. Roosevelt gave to our interests in Europe.

---

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] Letter to Holls, July 4, 1903, Theodore Roosevelt, *Presidential Addresses and State Papers*, 8 vols. (New York, 1910), Vol. 3, p. 509. For utopian critics who maintain that the national interest must be an empty concept without concrete meaning, the following attempt by Roosevelt to give it content may prove illuminating: "As long as England succeeds in keeping up the balance of power in Europe, not only on principle, but in reality, well and good; should she, however, for some reason or other fail in doing so, the United States would be obliged to step in at least temporarily in order to reestablish the balance of power in Europe, never mind against which country or group of countries our efforts may have to be directed." Quoted in Tyler Dennett, *Roosevelt and the Russo-Japanese War* (Garden City, New York, 1925), p. 1.

[27] Letter to Senator Josiah W. Bailey, dated May 13, 1941, *F.D.R.: His Personal Letters*, ed. Elliott Roosevelt, 4 vols. (New York, 1947–50), Vol. 2, pp. 1154–55.

In short, it is untrue to imply that American statesmen have been free from concern for immediate strategic interests and have consistently taken "the long view." There is almost no evidence that in pursuing our national destiny we have been immune from the same basic considerations by which other members of the society of nations have been guided.[28] When this principle has been disregarded, as in certain military decisions in 1945, American security has been gravely imperilled.

However, the pursuit of separate national interests by the various independent states presents the most troublesome issue we face in appraising collective security. The problem which impaired collective security under the League, and which was perhaps more decisive than the defection of the United States in causing its downfall, was the unresolved conflict in the foreign policies of the principal powers. The conceptions of the national interests of France and England clashed with one another and with the principles of the League. France had one overarching objective: the absolute security of its territory. In French eyes, the one conspicuous threat it faced was Germany, which bordered France and perpetually endangered its northeastern frontier. In 1935–36, the second attack on the integrity of the League was launched with Mussolini's cruel "Rape of Ethiopia," which Il Duce preferred to describe euphemistically as a "civilizing mission." The dilemma with which France was confronted provides us with the classic instance of the political problem.

For France the sole threat against which sanctions had been prepared was Germany. Italy's aggressive action represented the wrong threat, at the wrong time, at the wrong border. Italy was the natural ally of France for, aligned with the much publicized Italian army, France hoped to balance the preponderance of the land forces of Germany, especially after Germany had moved into the Rhineland. The character of French foreign policy made it highly improbable that France could support sanctions up to the point where French loyalty to the Covenant would cost France its recent *entente* with Italy against Germany. British opinion appeared to accept this fact and Mr. Churchill observed that "the Foreign Secretary [Mr. Eden] was *justified in going as far with the League of Nations against Italy as he could carry France;* but I added that he ought not to put any pressure upon France because of her military convention with Italy and her German preoccupations; and that in the circumstances I did not expect France would go very far."[29] In simplest terms, the choice for France was between the long range precedent which effective action might provide against the likelihood of German expansion and the immediately tangible results of not losing an ally against Germany. France compromised and sanctions were applied only half-heartedly.

---

[28] One of the most significant documents in the annals of recent American foreign policy was the blueprint of strategic interests in World War II called the "Joint Board Estimate of United States Over-all Production Requirements." Dated September 11, 1941, it was signed by the Chiefs of Staff, General Marshall and Admiral Stark. Paragraph 5 provided: "Those major national objectives of the United States which are related to military policy may broadly be stated as: preservation of the territorial, economic and ideological integrity of the United States and of the remainder of the Western Hemisphere; prevention of the disruption of the British Empire; prevention of the further extension of Japanese territorial dominion; eventual establishment in Europe and Asia of balances of power which will most nearly ensure political stability in those regions and the future security of the United States; and, so far as practicable, the establishment of regimes favorable to economic freedom and individual liberty." This unequivocal statement of our basic objectives and interests puts to rest the illusion that World War II was conceived and conducted by American leaders who took no stock in the need for discriminating judgments respecting vital interests. Quoted in Sherwood, *Roosevelt and Hopkins*, Vol. 1, p. 496.

The political problem also presents itself in regard to actual enforcement. Who is to apply sanctions? Who is to carry the burden of overt military action? In 1935–36, Britain alone was in a position to cut Mussolini's lines of communication and isolate his army. If genuine sanctions and force had been applied, the British navy would have shouldered the main burden. Yet there were murmurings by admirals and statesmen that the navy was ill-prepared, that there was ammunition for only about thirty minutes of fighting. British foreign policy, in contrast to that of France, directed that a stand should be taken. But the military component for action was lacking. In any enforcement action, since states are unequal, someone must bear more than his share. For this the British were unready in 1935–36.

The political problem has returned to plague Western society in the actions of the United Nations. The foreign policies of some nations have clashed periodically with the resolutions of that body. France and England are probably second and third-rate powers. England in particular has sensed this and has sought to husband her resources. Her first duty has been to her interests in Europe. She has maintained that a threat to her survival could come only from Europe. Any new action that would drain off a single drop of strength for efforts not in the national interest has been viewed with alarm. Moreover, England's policy has been one of watchful waiting in China. Under present conditions, the hope has been fostered that wise diplomacy could drive a wedge between the USSR and China, so that they would cease to march as members of a well-drilled team. The later phases of the UN's Korean policy have conflicted at every point with British Far Eastern policy. Is it surprising, therefore, that she has been a reluctant partner? The foreign policies of the member states, including those of the West, have diverged within the United Nations precisely as they did in 1935–36. Only the overwhelming power and material and political influence of the United States, made possible by the decline and exhaustion of postwar European and Asian powers, have prevented a repetition of the earlier experience. Unless nations have a margin of power beyond that essential to their survival, they can hardly be expected to share in the defense of a principle.

The Psychological Problem. Collective security founders on other shoals. It sometimes breaks down because of collective resentments or hatreds and reactions which express certain features of a particular national character. In 1931, the Japanese spilled over into Manchuria. Why was it that more positive action was not taken? To be sure there were legal, economic, and political obstacles existing. "War" in international relations is a weaselword, and debates which surround it easily become legal quagmires. Japan said it had not declared war, China had not done so, and therefore the bombs were a mere illusion. Behind this legal smokescreen the struggle went on and men were as dead as if they had fought in a legally more respectable war. Economically, the world was deep in a painful depression; politically, Manchuria seemed far away and of little immediate interest to Western nations. There was in addition, however, a psychological factor. Certain groups in the West harbored deep resentments against the victims of Japanese imperialism. In particular, certain elements within the British trading community remembered private scores that had not been settled and the recent ingratitude of the Chinese toward the West. This sector of Western public opinion took a kind of vicarious pleasure in the punishment the Japanese were inflicting upon China which, with India, became a symbol of the heavy toll being taken economically and psychologically in Europe by Asia's revolt. The Japanese action was unconsciously viewed as a retaliation against the whole anti-foreign movement that was sweeping Asia.

---

[29] Winston S. Churchill, *The Second World War: The Gathering Storm* (Boston, 1948), p. 169.

Another psychological factor was the attitude of responsible naval and military experts in Britain. One major result of the Washington Treaties of 1921–22 had been to leave Japan supreme on all fronts in the Far East. Its strategic position made it virtually immune from any serious attack. This confronted the newborn collective system with a military and naval problem which was made more acute by the prospects of joint operations by British and American naval forces. To British naval experts, American admirals and naval leaders were a boisterous and unproven lot. They had emerged overnight as the one irresistible threat to British naval supremacy. As youngsters in naval warfare, they would as likely as not prove erratic and unreliable under fire. Therefore, for Britain to commit herself unqualifiedly to a policy of military and naval intervention in an area where the newly acquired American naval supremacy would prevail would be risky and hazardous to British national interests. The disdain in which British naval leaders held their American opposite numbers was a psychological factor of great importance in 1931.[30]

In 1950–51, a new psychological obstacle appeared to block effective universal collective security. The British have had a Far Eastern policy for nearly a century-and-a-half. To them the policy of the United Nations, as influenced by the United States and especially by its spectacular and outspoken general, was from the first based on false assumptions. When General MacArthur's abortive thrust toward the Yalu River was turned back and the one action which all Western policy had sought to forestall—the intervention of the Chiese Communists—followed, the British reaction, however restrained, was clearly inevitable. Given the policy, the outcome was inescapable.

---

[30] The psychological turn of mind among certain professional Western soldiers before the Second World War offers a further illustration of this point. Admiration and respect for Germany's amazing rearmament program inspired the opinion that the conquest of England by Germany would prove the inevitable superiority of ground and air over sea power.

Peaceful Change. Collective security, as we have seen, depends upon agreed concepts of justice in international society shared by all or most of its members. In domestic societies this consensus is arrived at by public opinion's availing itself of the instruments of government in registering the majority will. If societies were characterized by ideal justice and perfect equilibrium among contending social groups, the problems of social change would perhaps disappear. Since the demands for social change are continuously asserted in the market place and resolved in legislative and electoral debates, the pursuit of abstract justice assumes less urgency than the claims for justice of particular social groups.

In every society two social forces inevitably exist in basic tension with one another. The one force comprises the groups supporting the status quo as stabilized and perpetuated in the political and legal order of the day. Another force made up of the groups sharing common opposition to the status quo seeks to change or overturn it. In the light of this conflict, the basic problem of government is to provide ways by which continuity is achieved and social change not prevented. Within organized and integrated societies, the courts historically have contributed continuity whereas legislatures have been the faithful agents of change. As Congress was the forum in which the claims and grievances of distressed groups were alleviated by New Deal laws and decrees in the 1930's, the British Parliament in the nineteenth century was the agency in which the middle-class revolt against feudalism was expressed and achieved.

It should be apparent, however, that the process of change in society is made possible by other agencies as well. The executive has provided an instrument through which opinion can be channeled and transformed into effective policy. Peaceful change thus involves the whole of society with its orderly machinery through which social groups seek support for their claims elevated into principles of justice that must be compatible with the society's fundamental values. It is the whole of domestic society, therefore, and not the legislature in isolation, that brings about social change. For while the making of new laws is the formal act of social change, the role of legislatures is essentially the ratification of the choices at which unorganized society has already arrived. This is made possible by the generally accepted framework of justice within which disputes can be settled.

It is obvious that the conditions and institutions which exist within domestic societies are absent or greatly weakened in international society. Legislative bodies with law-making powers capable of fulfilling the functions that Congress or any other legislature performs are conspicuously absent on the international scene. The General Assembly has the power to "make recommendations" on matters prescribed in the Charter; the Security Council may "decide" on measures to be taken and "call upon" members to act. While these powers appear to mark an advance, in practice they have hardly resulted in any especially decisive step toward international law-making. The basic defects in the structure of international society are nowhere more apparent than in connection with peaceful change. Some observers maintain that the least satisfactory provisions of both the Charter and the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals are those dealing with pacific settlement. At San Francisco, substantial criticism of these provisions was made. Chapter VIII, Section A of the Proposals dealing with peaceful settlement was subject to sufficient attack to require its revision by the Technical Committee and the Coordination Committee. If more time had been available, further changes no doubt would have been made. For example, it is unclear whether parties shall seek a solution only to those disputes "likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace" by the means specified in Article 33, and if so who shall decide if the dispute is likely to endanger the peace. A substitute phrase was offered toward the close of the conference which provided: "The parties to any international dispute shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, etc. . . . so that the maintenance of international peace and security will not be endangered." In the time remaining at San Francisco, this change could not be instituted; exaggerated concern with collective enforcement at the expense of accommodation and adjustment as instruments of peace appears to have been largely responsible for this shortcoming in most of the preliminary discussions.

If the provisions contained in the Charter are not fully satisfactory, there is a more basic issue in connection with peaceful change. Collective security if pursued to its logical conclusion is probably incompatible with peaceful change. In the 1930's, the Far Eastern situation deteriorated to a point where serious observers maintained that only military intervention could restore a stable balance of power. It was plain for all to see that Japan by its invasion of Manchuria was guilty of aggression. By its action, Japan had flouted its treaty obligations under international law. Yet the Japanese action in another respect was only an overt recognition that the treaties had become mere "scraps of paper" not based on political realities.

The staunchest advocate of firmness in Asia, Henry L. Stimson, conceded that the test for collective security had come in the worst part of the world. For the issue there was not what the law was but what it ought to be. He said at the time: "The peace treaties of modern Europe made out by the Western nations of the world no more fit the three great races of Russia, Japan, and China, who are meeting in Manchuria, than . . . a stovepipe hat would fit an African savage."[31] Yet the claims of these nations for justice and the need for safeguarding the integrity of the collective system became mutually incompatible. If collective security was to survive, every treaty would have to be defended or the structure's prestige would be undermined. Therefore, Mr. Stimson was forced to conclude: "Nevertheless, they are parties to these treaties and the whole world looks on to see whether the treaties are good for anything or not, and if we lie down and treat them like scraps of paper nothing will happen, and in the future the peace movement will receive a blow that it will not recover from for a long time."[32] The dilemma of collective security has been that its major proponents have been driven to oppose social change in the name of the sanctity of treaties. And since the agencies of social change which are available on the domestic scene are not present in international society, the military redress of claims or grievances has often appeared to be the sole rational alternative to the allegedly aggrieved parties.

---

[31] Stimson, *On Active Service*, p. 233.

To the extent that peaceful change is provided for in the Charter itself, Article 14 grants power to the General Assembly to recommend "measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin." Yet although this principle is less concrete and specific than what Senator Vandenberg proposed,[33] it has remained essentially a dead letter. For while it was invoked on the occasion of the Palestine dispute, it was subsequently abandoned and repudiated by the American delegation. Therefore the problem of peaceful change, which threatened and eventually destroyed the League and the Holy Alliance, has likewise imperilled and threatens to destory the United Nations security system.

THE UNREALITY OF TWO APPROACHES TO COLLECTIVE SECURITY

In the face of the problems we have outlined and discussed, two approaches to the idea and the reality of collective security have vied with one another in recent years. The one demands in the name of a principle that all nations at all times resist aggression. Its adherents maintain that only in this way can the national interests of independent states be protected and served. This approach takes its stand on the abstract and uncorruptible ideal of collective security.

Another approach, based primarily on what we have denoted the reality of collective security, reaches other conclusions on the basis of opposing concepts and principles. In the present state of world affairs, we are told, a policy of collective security leads inevitably down the road of general war and universal catastrophe. The Founding Fathers of this Republic knew more clearly than their present day heirs the futility of seeking to coerce sovereign states. At the Constitutional Convention of 1787, it was argued that unless states were united in one sovereign government (which both approaches agree is absent from the international scene today), they could be coerced only through civil war. Alexander Hamilton declared to the New York State Convention, met to ratify the new Constitution: "to coerce the states is one of the maddest projects that was ever devised. A failure of compliance will never be confined to a single state. This being the case can we suppose it wise to hazard a civil war."[34] Writing in the same tradition, Hans J. Morgenthau has maintained: "Under a system of collective security operating under less than ideal conditions, war between A and B or between any other two nations anywhere in the world is of necessity tantamount to war among all or at best most nations of the world."[35] Since ideal conditions are not presently in sight, collective security is tantamount to war.

---

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] Senator Vandenberg urged that the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals include: "If the Security Council finds that any situation which it shall investigate involves injustice to peoples concerned it shall recommend appropriate measures of adjustment which may include revision of treaties and of prior international decisions." Vandenberg, *Private Papers*, p. 163.

Thus the West is presented, in theory at least, with a choice between almost equally hopeless and catastrophic alternatives. Through the fact of membership in the United Nations, Western nations are committed to a system of collective security embodied in the Charter. Confronted with reality, however, the staunchest champions of collective security are driven to invoke a dual standard as a guide for action. On the one hand, they must firmly resolve on principle to intervene to arrest aggression at its source. On the other hand, while unable to disavow the principle, in concrete actions they are required to apply it judiciously with immense self-restraint.

The gulf between principles and actions in 1935–36 and again in 1950 illustrates the irony of collective security in the real world for, under its dispensation, Mussolini's aggression in Ethiopia and the North Korean invasion of South Korea made intervention a foregone conclusion. Once aggression is identified, the duty of the nations espousing collective security is unequivocal. Yet since Britain and France were unprepared in 1935, it was doubtful that more could be accomplished than to drive Italy into the camp of Germany. Notwithstanding, the viewpoint prevailed that if the champions of collective security did nothing, other more dangerous acts of aggression would follow.

The perils in pursuing the idea of collective security to its logical conclusion are matched only by the hazards involved in abandoning it. It is tempting to say that since collective security against a great power is unworkable, since psychological and political obstacles exist, and since the requirements for peaceful change are quite frequently at odds with enforcement, the system should be scrapped and replaced. Yet the coalition of the Western nations has been aroused to the threat confronting it by the resolute stand that was taken in Korea, and the whole free world has been animated and inspired by our boldness, courage and, lately, our patience and restraint. In the struggle against Soviet imperialism, it is vital that we have firm friends and willing allies who recognize mutual interests. We can best assure their cooperation by preserving and strengthening the tenuous ties by which all are bound together within the United Nations.

Perhaps the supreme paradox of American foreign policy today is the necessity placed upon us to seize and employ the essentially utopian instruments of collective security in a brutally realistic power struggle. Its agencies furnish a political framework through which the broad coalition of the free world can be strengthened and a more stable equilibrium of world power be restored. Britain and France and the free powers of Asia are more likely to play their part and contribute to the restoration of a balance of power in Europe and Asia if we assure them of support through mutual guarantees and create confidence by discussions in the halls and anterooms of the United Nations.

---

[34] Quoted in Harrop Freeman and Theodore Paullin, *Coercion of States in Federal Unions* (Philadelphia, 1943), p. 14. The late Professor Edwin Borchard warned: "There is no element of the proposal of punishing aggressors which is not contested by history and disproved by experience." "The Impracticability of Enforcing Peace," *The Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 55, p. 968 (Aug., 1946).

[35] Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations* (New York, 1948), p. 335.

Collective security, with its present foundations weakened and enfeebled, can contribute to peace and order if wisely and moderately employed. It has become clear in Korea that policies undertaken in the name of collective security are not necessarily tantamount to world war. Localized struggles are still possible if major powers are not confounded by the ideal or misled by a too absolute interpretation of the meaning of collective enforcement. Moreover, the influence of other nations more skilled in historic diplomacy has served within the United Nations as a kind of built-in restraint on the impulses of American foreign policy. Our partners in utopia have nudged us in the direction of what would appear to be a more realistic foreign policy. Beyond this, with the recent breakup of the simple bi-polar balance of power in the world, the practical uses for collective agencies may be multiplied indefinitely as the prospect of action by coalitions of members against independent if minor centers of power becomes a reality.

The uses of collective security are more modest and limited than its more ardent advocates appreciate. Yet if participants base their policies on enduring political principles and judge and measure each action by the interests and power involved, it need not be an inevitable blind alley. Between the scylla of blind acceptance and the charybdis of logical rejection we must aim to establish the intellectual foundations required for an empirical and pragmatic approach to the modern concept of collective security.

THE LAW OF OLIGARCHY

C. W. CASSINELLI
Whitman College

One of the most interesting generalizations in the field of social science is Robert Michels' "iron law of oligarchy." The commentary on this hypothesis has usually been motivated by a desire to attack or to support it; seldom has anyone made a serious attempt to understand it before passing judgment. This situation is partially Michels' responsibility, since his statement of the law of oligarchy is badly confused and quite incomplete. Nevertheless, the notion that "oligarchies prevail" has a high degree of general credibility, and even the realization that Michels' statement of it is inadequate and his evidence for it inconclusive does not destroy its intellectual appeal.

In this paper I shall be concerned exclusively with an attempt to make the law of oligarchy understandable. This involves formulating the generalization as precisely as possible, defining its important terms, and stating its sources of evidence. This is not an investigation into what Michels "really meant," but an examination of what he said that is good political theory. I shall feel free to make any changes or additions which appear necessary to me. But such alterations will be primarily matters of definition and logical organization.

Since Michels never labels a particular sentence with the title "the law of oligarchy," we are obliged to construct the law on the basis of several of his general statements about a "ruling class in society."[1] Let us take the following as a preliminary statement of the law of oligarcay: *For any x, if x is an organization, then x is an oligarchy.* This does not convey much information, except that Michels utilizes the notion of organization, a decided advance beyond the vague notions about "class" or "stratum" or "group" expressed by other "elitists" like Mosca and Pareto. In order to put meaning into this preliminary statement, two concepts, that of organization and that of oligarchy, must be analyzed.

I

It is absolutely necessary to specify as precisely as possible what is meant by "organization" in our law, not only for considerations of accuracy and tidiness, but also in order to avoid the serious shortcoming of producing a law which is nothing more than a tautology. A common and understandable comment upon the law consists of asking if anything has been said other than that an organization is an organization, that in an organization some people give orders and others obey them, and that the latter usually outnumber the former. If the law of oligarchy is to be a significant generalization about political affairs, it must be shown how the concepts of organization and oligarchy differ from one another.

---

[1] Robert Michels, *Political Parties*, tr. by Eden and Cedar Paul (Glencoe, Ill., 1949), pp. 377, 390, 401, 402.

Neither of these concepts is defined by Michels, so we must look elsewhere for suggestions in order to find meanings which will make our law significant, and also as accurate as possible. With respect to organization, the first suggestion comes from Chester I. Barnard. He points out that an organization must be defined as a *system of activities* (or forces or efforts) of two or more human beings, rather than as a body of persons united for a special purpose, for the following three reasons: first, we consider an organization to persist despite continual turnovers in the personnel "of the organization"; second, a single person during the same period of his life can "belong to" more than one organization; and, third, a single act of a person can be an "organization-act" of more than one organization.[2] If an organization is taken to consist of human activities, rather than of human beings, our definition can be made consistent with these three important considerations.

Let us take, then, as the raw material, so to speak, of an organization the activities of human beings. The problem now is to put these activities into some kind of relationship or order with one another. The usual way in which this is done is by saying that such activities are "united for a purpose." When we introduce the concept of purpose into a discussion of this nature, it must be made very clear that the ethical meaning of "purpose" has no place whatsoever in the attempt to arrive at workable definitions of political concepts. What we are looking for is a purpose exhibited by human beings, exhibited in some kind of behavior, which can be attributed to all those groups of activities ordinarily called "organizations."

When the idea of purpose is introduced as a distinguishing characteristic of a group of activities, two problems of identification immediately arise: if the attributing of purpose to an organization is to make sense, then we must be able to identify the people who have the purpose and we must also be able to identify the object (or end or goal) to which the purpose is directed. Regarding the identification of the possessors of the purpose, the question is whether all the people who perform the activities which constitute the organization are to have the single purpose by which the activities are ordered or whether only a certain sub-group has this purpose. If the latter alternative is adopted, the most likely possibility would be to select as the given sub-group the "leaders" of the organization. There are, however, several objections to this choice. First, the identification of the leaders presupposes a knowledge of the definition of an organization; that is, the principle which orders the activities must be understood before it can be determined which of the activities are "leading" in nature. Second, it may be very difficult to single out a specific purpose, or type of purpose, common to all leaders, from among the many and diverse purposes which they presumably have. And, third, it appears rather arbitrary to exclude the purposes of the "lesser" members of the organization from a definitive position. Except for the first, these objections are probably not insuperable; but, as will be seen, we can make them irrelevant.

---

[2] Chester I. Barnard, *The Functions of the Executive* (Cambridge, Mass., 1938), Ch. VI. sec. I.

If we adopt the former alternative, that all the people who perform the activities which constitute an organization are to have the particular purpose by which the activities are ordered, then it can be seen that the probability that there will be a common purpose is rather low. Barnard tries to eliminate this difficulty by distinguishing between "subjective purpose" (personal motives) and "cooperative purpose." The latter is the consciousness on the part of the individual that his activity has a particular meaning in relation to the meanings which he imputes to all the other activities which "make up the organization."[3] But this distinction does not provide us with a purpose as an ordering principle, since the definition of co-operative purposes presupposes the definition of an organization.

The second problem of identification that arises when purpose is taken as the ordering principle that makes activities into an organization is that of identifying the object (or end or goal) to which the purpose is directed. This problem becomes acute when an organization is defined in terms of purpose in general: for example, "an organization is a system of purposive activities," or "an organization is a group of activities united by a common purpose." Unless the particular goal of the purpose of every set of activities which is supposed to constitute an organization can be specified, it is impossible to distinguish a set of activities that makes up an organization from a set of activities that does not. Merely saying that the activities are purposive, without trying to identify the goals, is an empty statement. However, when we attempt to escape this unusable generality, it becomes very difficult to find a specific purpose, or even a specific kind of purpose, which motivates the activities which make up an organization. The concept of organization includes within its scope phenomena ranging from the local athletic club through large business firms to international groups dealing with economic or political affairs. It is unlikely that a purpose common to these diverse groups can be found.

Furthermore, even if a purpose ordering the activities into a system could be found in the case of each organization, this still would not serve to distinguish organizations from groups of activities which obviously are not organizations. Barnard is willing to absorb this fact into his definition, and includes such groups of activities as manifested by mobs, concert-audiences, and two people changing an automobile-tire within the scope of his definition of organization.[4] This kind of definition not only is inconsistent with the customary usage of the word "organization," but also would not fit into any law of oligarchy, since it is rather ridiculous to say that a concert-audience is an oligarchy, no matter how the latter concept is defined.

With respect to this problem, we should consider another suggestion, made this time by Max Weber. He says that an organization is a system of *continuous* purposive activity.[5] This is an interesting addition to our theory, but it fails to account for two things: first, groups of activities like those exhibited by concert-audiences (or by any habitual mass-activities) are not eliminated, that is, these activities can be continuous, since the same people need not perform them; and, second, many organizations are short-lived, persisting hardly long enough to be called "continuous."

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 87.

[4] Barnard, *op. cit.*, pp. 102, 104n.

[5] Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, tr. by Parsons and Henderson (New York, 1947), p. 151.

In view of all these various limitations to the defining of the concept of organization in terms of purpose in general or of a particular purpose, it would be wise to seek another type of approach. One characteristic which is exhibited by those groups of activities ordinarily considered to be organizations is the existence of a *specialization of function,* by which the many activities are ordered into a system. Specialization of function is an attribute which is fully objective, which is relatively simple to understand, which is usually considered as essential to an organization, and which can easily be identified in the course of empirical observation. Of course, there is purpose involved in specialization of function, but we can identify such an order without having to identify the purpose or purposes behind it.

The specialization of function among activities can, with profit, be taken as a necessary condition of an organization, but it is not sufficient. With only this characteristic as a differentia, groups of activities such as the two men changing the tire or as A's sweeping the streets and B's teaching school would constitute organizations. Another qualification is needed, and here Max Weber provides us with a second suggestion: in his definition of a "corporate organization" he says that the association of activities is characterized by an administrative staff "devoted to such continuous purposive activity."[6] Let us simplify this and say that the additional defining characteristic of an organization is *the intent to maintain the existence of the specialized activities.* This intent is manifested in one or more of the given activities, that is, it is one of the specialized functions; and its goal is to maintain the other activities in their relationships to one another. The maintenance-activities may include within their scope the intent to maintain such maintenance-activities, but it is not necessary that they do so. (This avoids any fallacy of types, since one activity is directed to making future activities of the same kind possible.) There is never, of course, a completely rigid set of functional interrelations in an organization, and there is seldom the intent to maintain a completely rigid set. When there is a large enough change in these interrelations, we say that a "reorganization" has occurred.

The intent to maintain specialization is a notion which also obviously involves purpose. But the problem of discovering whether or not such a purpose exists is much more simple than the similar problem under the other definitions of organization discussed above. The maintenance-activities are performed, usually, by a small proportion of the people who contribute to the organization, and this makes it easy to locate them. There is much less difficulty in determining whether or not a given set of activities is of the maintenance-variety than there is in finding a purpose common to all or even to the majority of the members of the organization. The goal of the purpose is the same in every organization and it is specific and objective, and thus readily discoverable. Taking specialization of function and intent to maintain such specialization as the defining characteristics of an organization avoids the kind of circularity which definitions based upon the notions of "leaders" and "co-operative purposes" cannot avoid. It is not necessary to know what an organization is in order to identify the intent to maintain specialization of function and the people who carry out this intent; all that need be known is what such specialization is. This type of definition also includes our general feeling that persistence or continuity in time has an intimate connection with organization, and yet it allows for the fact that some organizations are short-lived.

---

[6] Weber, *loc. cit.*

The definition of the concept of organization is this: An organization is a group of human activities ordered by a system of specialization of function; a sub-group of these activities has as its goal the maintenance of this order or of an order very similar to it.

II

Having defined one of the concepts in the law of oligarchy, it remains to analyze the other, the concept of oligarchy, This, needless to say, is the crucial notion in the entire law, the notion which determines the meaning and hence the validity of the generalization. The term "oligarchy" is not especially fortunate, since its ordinary connotation is more narrow than the one that must be given it in the present discussion, and since it is ordinarily ambiguous, referring both to rule by the few and to rule by the wealthy.[7] Furthermore, the idea of ruling associated with the notion of oligarchy is inconvenient since the law of oligarchy, as I shall formulate it, will not include any specific reference to the function of ruling. However, there is a tradition in political science regarding the notion of oligarchy which counteracts the associations of meaning described above. This is the tradition begun by Michels himself, and I am supposing it to be strong enough to prevent a violation of the common usage of the word "oligarchy" and to eliminate the task of inventing a new word by which to refer to the phenomenon being linked with organization by means of our law.[8]

The first thing that must be kept in mind is that the concept of organization implies that certain of the activities which make up the organization are "executive" or "leadership" activities—that is, activities involving authority—and that the people who perform these activities are much less numerous than those who perform the remaining activities. It is this group of leadership activities with which the law of oligarchy is obviously concerned.

---

[7] See Carl J. Friedrich, "Oligarchy," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Science*, Vol. 11, pp. 462–65.

[8] Michels never defines his concept of oligarchy. For his somewhat inconsistent suggestions regarding the nature of oligarchy, see *Political Parties*, pp. 136, 144, 145, 154, 389, 390.

Let us approach the problem of defining the concept of oligarchy by listing the possible meanings of "oligarchy" in our law, or rather by stating the possible relevant inferences that can be drawn from the statement that an organization exists. With this list in mind it will be easier to understand why a particular choice must be made. As I see it, there are five possibilities which the law could be stating; these are, in the order of increasing complexity:

(1) In political affairs some people, usually a minority, give orders and the rest of the people obey these orders. This possibility should be immediately rejected, because even if it does not say only that an organization is an organization it contributes practically nothing to our knowledge regarding politics.

(2) As a second possibility, the law might state that the leaders, who are a minority, are the sole source of any significant political action. This means that of the activities that make up an organization only those activities which are concerned with giving orders—that is, the "leadership" or "executive" functions—are relevant to the understanding of the political process.

(3) Another possibility is that the law says that only by means of such executive activities can significant political actions take place. This would make it a theory of the loci of political power.

Possibilities (2) and (3) suggest very important political hypotheses, which might be (inaccurately) summarized like this: specialization of function, with authority vested in a minority, is the best or perhaps the only way to get any important political results. But this amounts to saying that organization is needed for action, a statement that can hardly be put into the form of our law of oligarchy. In short, the law of oligarchy as I have adapted it from Michels concerns the results of organization, not the causes of it.

(4) The next possible meaning that can be given to the law of oligarchy, by means of a definition of the concept of oligarchy, is the following: the executive or leadership activities in an organization are free from control by the other activities; or, putting it another way, the people who hold positions of authority within an organization are not checked by those who hold subsidiary positions within the organization. (This is the meaning of the law which I propose to adopt, and hence the necessary qualifications can be introduced later.)

(5) The final possible formulation of the law of oligarchy is the most spectacular. It says that the people in positions of authority pursue their own interests, disregarding the interests of the mass of mankind, a procedure which leads to the exploitation of this mass. There are two objections to this theory. First, it is impossible to determine what constitutes the "interests" of the leaders and of the led, because an objective theory of interest requires that the people who are to be given the interests must themselves define them; and it is patently impossible to discover that all organizations are characterized by conflicts of interest and exploitation. But, in the second place, if we choose some objective standards, such as good food, comfortable homes, leisure, medical care, security, and deference, the statement that organization leads to exploitation is quite clearly false; and the statement that it leads to conflicts

of interest may be true regarding some of the standards, such as deference, but it is hardly a significant addition to our political knowledge.

These five formulations of the law of oligarchy are the ones which have been used by theorists of "the ruling class," and I believe that they exhaust the significant possibilities.[9] As I said above, the fourth formulation involving lack of control is the one which I consider both valid and informative, and I shall now proceed to make this formulation as precise as possible.

There are, first of all, a matter of terminology and a matter of logical relationship which must be resolved. Michels uses the term "oligarchy" to refer to the "ruling minority," that is, to a group of human beings. It is more reasonable to use the word "oligarchs" in order to designate these people, and reserve "oligarchy" as the name of an organization which has such and such characteristics, that is, an organization which possesses oligarchs. Now it must be pointed out that taking this approach makes organization a (logical) necessary condition of oligarchy. This convention will lead to no difficulties since it conforms to ordinary usage[10] and since the significance of our law of oligarchy lies in its stating that organization is a sufficient condition of oligarchy, a statement which is, as we shall see, an empirical generalization.

The definition of the concept of oligarchy to be adopted is the following: An oligarchy is an organization characterized by the fact that part of the activities of which it consists, viz., the activities having the highest degree of authority (which have been called "leadership" or "executive" activities), are free from control by any of the remainder of the organizational activities. This concept leads to a generalization which might be called "a theory of irresponsible leadership."

The key notion in this definition is that of freedom from control, a notion which must be specified in order for the definition to make sense. Freedom from control does not mean that the leaders can completely ignore the actions and desires of the lower ranks in the organization. Their activities are always guided, at least to some extent, by considerations regarding, metaphorically speaking, the material with which they must work.[11] As Machiavelli says, the Prince accommodates himself to the people and to the times. Or, as Professor Friedrich has stated it, the leaders anticipate the reactions of the led.[12] Freedom from control means that the executive activities are not restricted by the subordinate activities with regard to their positive content and direction. Since this is very difficult to express, let us consider an analogy. The sculptor is restricted in his action by the size, shape, pattern, hardness, brittleness, etc., of the particular piece of marble with which he is working. But the marble has no control over what the sculptor wishes to make out of it, given that his possible choices are restricted as described above. It is in this sense that executive activities are free from control in an oligarchy. The subordinate activities do not explicitly direct the form (or even the purpose) of the executive activities; they have only a "negative" or "restrictive" influence. To put it more bluntly, and somewhat less precisely, the executive can do what he wants to do, as long as he knows how to handle the human material with which he must work.

---

[9] Michels, as usual, is very imprecise: all five meanings can be found, undifferentiated, in his book; but his chief sin is his unannounced shift in emphasis from (4) lack of control (pp. 136, 144, 145, 154) to (5) exploitation (pp. 389, 390). Gaetano Mosca in *The Ruling Class*, tr. by Kahn (New York, 1939), pp. 50, 154, 329, also mixes meanings (4) and (5), and moreover stresses the obvious by emphasizing meaning (1), that political direction is the function of a minority.

[10] See Friedrich, "Oligarchy," cited above, n. 7.

[11] Cf. Michels, *op. cit.*, p. 156, and Mosca, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

[12] Carl J. Friedrich, *Constitutional Government and Democracy* (Boston, 1946), p. 589.

It can be seen that the implications of this definition of oligarchy are not as "elitist" as they might appear at first glance, by reflecting that our entire discussion is concerned only with the situation *within a single organization.* Nothing as yet has been said about the relation of any given organization to external groups, organized or unorganized.

By adopting a definition of oligarchy which is stated in terms of human activities and not of human beings, allowance is made for the fact that the same people are not always leaders or executives. This is tantamount to saying that our definition is consistent with the theory of "the circulation of elites."[13] If the law of oligarchy is to attribute special power to a minority of people, it must be designed to account for the fact that this minority changes in personnel, usually gradually by absorption and assimilation of "new blood," but occasionally suddenly by a replacement of one group of people by another. Relative permanence in personnel "indirectly favors" oligarchy, according to Michels,[14] but as will be seen this tendency is not directly connected with the phenomenon of organization; and thus our law need not take it into account.

The law of oligarchy, at this stage of its development, reads as follows: For any x, if x is a group of human activities ordered by a system of specialization of function, a sub-group of this group having as its goal the maintenance of this order or of an order very similar to it, then those activities of x which have the highest degree of authority are free from control by any of the remainder of the activities ordered by the system.

III

As stated, the law of oligarchy could be taken as an empirical generalization, arrived at by observing many organizations and noticing that they are all oligarchies. But our evidence is available in more specific categories, and we are able to answer the question: Why are organizations always oligarchies? In fact, Michels' book is primarily concerned with the several answers to this question, although he apparently did not think it important to tell us precisely what organizations and oligarchies happen to be. The answers are in the form of generalizations less broad in scope than the law of oligarchy, and we might consider them to be stating the causes of oligarchy. When these subsidiary or supporting generalizations are stated, the law of oligarchy becomes a hypergeneralization which says that a certain proportion of the supporting generalizations are applicable to every instance of an organization.

---

[13] For Michels' statement of this theory see his *Political Parties,* p. 378.

[14] *Op. cit.,* p. 127.

Michels distinguishes between two general types of causes of oligarchy, which may be called "technical" and "psychological," respectively. I intend to state these in a very casual way, since putting them in good logical and causal order both internally and with respect to one another and to the law of oligarchy would bury our discussion in non-essential details. If it is remembered that these supporting generalizations are directed to the end of explaining why the leaders are free from control, then there should be no confusion.

The generalizations expressing the technical causes of oligarchy are the following: The large number of members of an organization prohibits any regular intercourse among them. The large number of issues that must be decided upon prevents the mass from participating in the making of most of these decisions. Organizational duties become so complex and complicated that only experts can handle them. Organizational duties become so numerous that they can be handled only by professionals, men who devote their time and energy exclusively to these duties.[15]

The generalizations expressing the psychological causes are as follows: Only a small number of people are interested in public affairs. The majority of people feel a need to be directed and guided. The majority of people have a sense of gratitude to the men who guide and direct them. The leader comes to be regarded as indispensable by the mass. The leader comes to consider himself as possessing a right to the office which he holds. Only a few people are capable of performing the functions of leadership. The exercise of power has a conservative effect, and the leader tends to use all his power to retain his position of power. The leader comes to regard the organization, and his own office, as more important than the professed goal of the organization.[16]

There is a rather important difference between technical and psychological causes. While the former are connected with the nature of organization and specialization of function, the latter have no special connection with the essence of organization. The phenomena of mass-apathy, consolidation of power, "hero-worship," etc., occur in any large group, whether or not it is an organization. By formulating the law of oligarchy in terms of organizations, we are able to take advantage of the existence of these psychological causes; while the technical causes, upon the existence of which our law depends for its validity, do not come within the scope of a law formulated in other terms, say "ruling class" or "organized minority." Furthermore, if we dispense with the concept of organization and talk, as Mosca does,[17] about the domination of society by a minority, we have said nothing more than that in political affairs some people, who are usually in a minority, give orders and the rest of the people obey them. I have already commented on this statement, which is little more than a truism. The psychological causes alone are not enough to establish freedom from control on the part of the ruling minority, as modern representative governments have shown.

---

[15] The respective sources for these generalizations are the following pages of *Political Parties:* 25, 27, 28, 36.

[16] *Political Parties*, pp. 49, 53, 60, 86, 95, 206, 373.

[17] *The Ruling Class*, p. 329.

With the introduction of the supporting generalizations and of the distinction between technical and psychological causes, the law of oligarchy becomes a hyper-generalization, stating that the technical causes accompany every organization and also that some proportion of the psychological causes are also present, a proportion which differs from organization to organization, depending upon factors like the length of time the leaders have held their positions (see above).

The validity of the law of oligarchy depends, of course, upon the correctness of the generalizations stating the existence of the technical causes. I do not intend to argue in support of these generalizations, since such a task is beyond the scope of the present paper. It is obvious, however, that such an argument must rest upon an investigation into the nature of organizations. (Michels devotes not more than one-quarter of his book to this kind of investigation; the remainder is concerned with the less important and, I think, less interesting psychological causes; but he has stated these latter systematically and clearly).

IV

It has probably occurred to the reader that not all organizations exhibit the properties necessary for the existence of the technical causes. These properties were, it will be remembered, a large number of members, a large number of issues requiring action, and complicated and numerous organizational duties. The obvious inference is that the law of oligarchy applies only to large organizations. Moreover, we know that small organizations are usually not oligarchies. If a small organization does happen to be characterized by freedom from control regarding the executive activities, then the causes of this characteristic must be psychological in nature. Since our formulation of the law of oligarchy depends exclusively upon the concept of organization and since the properties necessary for the existence of the psychological causes do not follow from this concept, we must amend the law so that it refers only to large organizations. The problem is to determine what a large organization is.

This is clearly a very difficult problem, as are all such problems in political science involving the drawing of lower limits to a quantitative concept. Apparently Michels considers the crux of the issue to be the numerical limit to regular intercourse among the members of the organization, the condition required for our first technical cause. On the basis of this approach, he suggests a limit in the interval 1000–10,000.[18] Organizations with memberships exceeding 1000–10,000 fall within the scope of our law and are thus oligarchies. However, the number and complexity of the issues to be decided and of the duties to be performed are not always proportional to the number of members of the organization; or, if they are proportional, they do not appear to be related to the possibilities of regular intercourse among the members. Whatever the solution to this problem is, it naturally depends upon an analysis of the causes of oligarchy within an organization; and, as far as I know, such an analysis has not as yet been made. In any event, the necessary complexity and quantity of issues and duties can be said to be associated with organizations whose membership exceeds a limit in the interval 1000–10,000, and this statement is accurate enough for our present purposes.

---

[18] *Political Parties*, p. 26; see also Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 415.

Consequently, the law of oligarchy must be qualified as follows: For any x, if x is an organization *and* the number of people involved in x, i.e., those who perform the activities of which x consists, exceeds 1000–10,000, then x is an oligarchy. (If we knew more about the conditions under which issues and duties become numerous and complex, then the qualifying clause could be expanded to include the proper minimum limits to these conditions.)

V

It will be of advantage to summarize the present account of the logical structure of the law of oligarchy in ordinary language, without any pretense of precision. What I have tried to do is to set forth what the law of oligarchy states; I have not been concerned with evaluating the truth of this statement. Such an endeavor is justified, among other reasons, because neither Michels nor anyone else has made a sustained attempt to specify the meaning of the law, a shortcoming which has led to its being credited with all kinds of wild assertions. And, as a consequence, most of the criticism of Michels' work has been beside the point.

The law of oligarchy states that, when an organization reaches a certain size and attains a certain degree of complexity, the people who exercise authority by virtue of their positions in the organization are controlled by the people with less authority only in the "negative" way described above. It must be remembered that the law of oligarchy is a hyper-generalization, depending for its validity upon the factual accuracy of the generalizations stating the technical causes of oligarchy. Thus "irresponsibility" of leadership which results from a non-technical cause, such as the hierarchical structure of a business or a military organization, is not covered by the law. However, even in the case of "legitimate" hierarchies the technical causes may be operative in the sense that those formally in control of the organization are unable, for reasons of size and complexity, to hold their nominal subordinates responsible. (This possibility is the one central to the theory of the "managerial revolution.") The circumstances under which the technical causes thus become operative are again part of the theory of the "supporting generalizations."

It is very important to keep in mind that the law says nothing about the situation which results from the organization's relations with other groups of people. It is concerned only with the situation *within* any single organization. Thus nothing can be inferred about the "oligarchical" nature of society or of the state, unless additional assumptions are introduced into the argument. But the law of oligarchy does tell us that wherever organizations occur in society, control of the organizational leadership must come from outside the organization. Michels[19] thinks that such control comes from the leaders of other organizations, when there are other organizations strong enough to challenge, and others have agreed with him. Thus the law itself is not inconsistent with "democracy," nor does it mean that human volition has nothing to do with the development of the political process.[20] The law of oligarchy says only that the leaders are not controlled by the members of their own organizations; it says nothing whatsoever about the number and relative strength of the organizations which occur within any society or state or even government.

[19] *Political Parties*, pp. 400–8.

[20] As David Spitz thinks; see his *Patterns of Anti-Democratic Thought* (New York, 1949), pp. 27–29.

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL MOVEMENT, 1933–1953*

HAROLD W. DAVEY
Iowa State College

Informed policy-making is the primary responsibility of any legislative body in a democracy. The policy-making task at all levels of government has become increasingly complex, technical and burdensome. This has been particularly evident in the years since the Great Depression. The demand for an increasing quantum of governmental services and functions at all levels and the competition among governmental units for revenue sources to finance public services have been chiefly responsible for magnifying the legislative burden. Hence it is surprising and disturbing that the people's policy-makers at the state level have been somewhat loath to reorganize their legislative processes and procedures to meet contemporary needs. Many "little Hoover" commissions have been busily engaged in recent years in attempting to modernize state administrative organization.[1] No correspondingly vigorous effort has been made at legislative self-examination, although the need is at least equally pressing. Only ten states have annual legislative sessions, in spite of the fact that informed students of state government generally agree that the volume of legislative business in most states requires annual sessions.[2] Few states have made substantial progress in streamlining and revising their committee systems. Only a few have undertaken to remove unrealistic constitutional prohibitions limiting the length of legislative sessions.

Thorough-going consideration of legislative reorganization is beyond the scope of this discussion.[3] We are concerned here solely with analyzing the legislative council or legislative research committee as one device for improving the state legislature's ability to deal intelligently with serious issues of policy.[4] The analysis deals with (1) the origins and purposes of legislative councils, (2) the organization and powers of legislative councils, (3) objections to the legislative council device, and (4) evaluation of the legislative council as a tool for improving the legislative product.

---

* The views expressed herein are solely those of the writer. Conclusions are based mainly on first-hand research by correspondence and personal interview. In 1948–49, the writer engaged in correspondence with legislative council personnel in about 20 states, principally with directors of council research departments. Analysis of academic literature and correspondence was supplemented in the summer of 1949 by a field trip for personal interviews to three legislative council states, Kansas, Illinois and Missouri. The writer also has profited by use of the Council of State Governments' Joint Reference Library in Chicago and by personal interviews with CSG staff personnel. Research done in 1948 and 1949 was brought up to date in 1952 and 1953 by additional correspondence with legislative council research personnel, CSG officials, and state legislators.

The writer wishes to acknowledge especially the help and encouragement of the following: Louis Dorweiler, Frederic Guild, Jack Isakoff, Arthur Y. Lloyd, Jack Rhodes and Herbert F. Wiltsee.

[1] Apparently, however, legislative translation of recommendations into action on the administrative re-organization front has not been particularly satisfactory. See Karl Bosworth, "The Politics of Management Improvement in the States," this REVIEW, Vol. 47, pp. 84–99 (March, 1953).

[2] The ten states with annual sessions are Arizona, California, Colorado, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and South Carolina.

[3] The Council of State Government's Committee on Legislative Processes and Procedures, in its excellent report, *Our State Legislatures* (Chicago, 1948), calls attention to the need for consideration of the following points:

I. ORIGINS AND PURPOSES OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

At least 32 states now have legislative councils or council-type agencies.[5] Kansas established the first council in 1933. Other states began to follow as their legislative burdens became so serious that they were forced to act. The

---

(1) Length and frequency of legislative sessions.

(2) Adequacy of compensation for legislators.

(3) Staggering of legislators' terms to insure continuity in leadership and legislative responsibility.

(4) Appointment of full-time legislative employees on the basis of merit and competence.

(5) Reduction and reorganization of legislative committees.

(6) Provision for public hearings on all major bills.

(7) Adequacy of clerical and research facilities for legislators. Consideration of need for legislative council and/or legislative reference service.

(8) Adequacy of the legislature's reference, research, bill-drafting, and statutory revision services.

(9) Limiting by rule the period during a legislative session when new bills may be introduced. Provision for drafting, filing and printing of bills before the opening of a legislative session.

(10) Need for a permanent joint committee on legislative organization, rules and procedure to expedite legislative procedure.

(11) Adequate budget for the legislature.

(12) Delegation of claims against the state to judicial or administrative agencies. Design of effective substitutes for special legislation on matters of purely local concern.

[4] In view of the rapid growth of the legislative council movement in recent years, the academic literature on legislative councils is surprisingly sparse. One of the best recent articles is Frederic H. Guild, "Legislative Councils: Objectives and Accomplishments," *State Government*, Vol. 22, pp. 217–19, 226 (Sept., 1949). See also Lawrence W. O'Rourke, *Legislative Assistance*, (University of California at Los Angeles Bureau of Governmental Research, 1951) and Norman Meller, "The Policy Position of Legislative Service Agencies," *The Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 5, pp. 109–23 (March, 1952). The University of Hawaii's Legislative Reference Bureau has released in mimeographed form an excellent research monograph on legislative councils and legislative reference services. Released in April, 1948 under the title *Legislative Aids*, this report may be obtained on a library loan basis from the Council of State Governments' Joint Reference Library, 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, Illinois. For valuable recent data on organization, appropriations, functions and powers of legislative councils, see Council of State Governments, *The Book of the States 1952–53* (Chicago, 1952), pp. 114–24. For additional bibliography on the legislative council movement, consult two reports by Frederic H. Guild in the *Law Library Journal*, Vol. 36, pp. 169–90 (Nov., 1943), and Vol. 42, pp. 60–75 (May, 1949).

[5] By April, 1953, Arizona, Colorado, and Montana had established legislative councils this year. Alaska also established a legislative council in 1953.

TABLE I. LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL STATES

State	Year of Adoption	Agency Name
Alabama	1945	Legislative Council
Arizona	1953	Legislative Council
Arkansas	1947	Legislative Council
Colorado	1953	Legislative Council
Connecticut	1937	Legislative Council
Florida	1949	Legislative Council
Illinois	1937	Legislative Council
Indiana	1945	Legislative Advisory Commission
Kansas	1933	Legislative Council
Kentucky	1948	Legislative Research Commission
Louisiana	1952	Legislative Council
Maine	1939	Legislative Research Committee
Maryland	1939	Legislative Council
Minnesota	1947	Legislative Research Committee
Missouri	1943	Committee on Legislative Research
Montana	1953	Legislative Council
Nebraska	1937	Legislative Council
Nevada	1945	Legislative Counsel Bureau
New Hampshire	1951	Legislative Council
New Mexico	1951	Legislative Council
North Dakota	1945	Legislative Research Committee
Ohio	1952*	Program Commission
Oklahoma	1939	Legislative Council
Pennsylvania	1937	Joint State Government Commission
South Carolina	1949	Legislative Council
South Dakota	1951	Legislative Research Council
Texas	1949	Legislative Council
Utah	1947	Legislative Council
Virginia	1936	Advisory Legislative Council
Washington	1947	Legislative Council
Wisconsin	1947	Joint Legislative Council
Wyoming	1951	Legislative Interim Committee

* Ohio is now counted by the Council of State Governments as a legislative council state.

council movement has accelerated considerably in the postwar period, as can be seen in Table I.

A legislative council may be defined as a permament joint committee of the DEF state legislature, assisted by a full-time professional research staff appointed by the council on the basis of merit. Most legislative councils are made up of an equal number of legislators from each house. The median size of legislative councils today is around 18 members. Councils ordinarily meet not less than four times a year, including years when the legislature is not in session. Thus one of the principal values of the legislative council device is to insure continuous attention to major areas of state policy between legislative sessions.

While legislative councils may perform a number of functions for the legislature, the primary purpose of their creation in most states has been to provide competent assistance to the legislature on major problems of state policy requiring research for informed action by the legislature. For this reason, the integrity and effectiveness of the council's research arm is of vital importance to the success of the legislative council idea. Appointments to the research staff must be made on the basis of professional qualifications. If research personnel were to be chosen on a partisan basis, the fundamental purpose of the legislative council idea would be in serious jeopardy.[6]

Among the functions that a legislative council may perform for the legislature, the following[7] may be listed:

1. Collect information on state government and on legislative proposals.
2. Prepare research reports on major issues of state policy.
3. Recommend legislation.
4. Draft bills embodying such recommendations.
5. Investigate administrative agencies to effect economies in state government.
6. Cooperate with administrative agencies or with special committees.
7. Study legislative procedures.
8. Study effect of statutory and constitutional provisions.
9. Study financial and personnel needs of state government.
10. Study revision of statutes.
11. Prepare legislative program.
12. Prepare public report on recommendations in advance of legislative sessions.

State laws differ materially in the functions assigned to their legislative councils. However, it can be stated with some confidence that *all* legislative councils or council-type agencies perform the following three major functions: (1) provide each legislator with his own source of factual information on state problems of current importance; (2) provide a mechanism that can insure coordinated and continuing study and consideration of major legislative problems between legislative sessions; (3) issue fact-finding reports, with or without specific policy recommendations, for the information of the legislators and citizens generally, usually in advance of the legislative session.

The first operative council was not the brain-child of some ivory tower political scientist dreaming of a legislative utopia. The inspiration for the Kansas legislative council plan came from Sam Wilson, manager of the Kansas Chamber of Commerce in the early 1930's.[8] State Chambers of Commerce customarily have standing committees on various subjects. Wilson appreciated that the Chamber's standing committees spent a great deal of time and effort in digging up factual background for their proposals for the legislature's consideration. It was suddenly borne in upon Wilson that the legislature itself, in the press of a legislative session, had completely inadequate facilities for obtaining accurate and reliable information to enable it to deal intelligently with all the multifarious problems coming before it. The recognition of this need by a practical business man was the real genesis of the Kansas legislative council.[9]

---

[6] The research arm of the council need not be large. The *sine qua non* here is quality of personnel. In most states, the council's research unit consists of two to four professional research men, plus requisite clerical assistance. In states with a large volume of varied legislative business, the research unit may be considerably larger. The Pennsylvania Joint State Government Commission research staff, for example, numbers 22, including economists, statisticians, accountants and other research personnel, according to Guy W. Davis, counsel and director, Pennsylvania Joint State Government Commission.

[7] This list of functions is adapted from Lawrence W. O'Rourke's study (cited in note 4).

[8] It should be pointed out, however, that the National Municipal League as early as 1921 recommended a legislative council as part of its model state constitution.

In the 20 years since Kansas established the first such agency, the legislative council has come to be regarded by professional students of state government as a device well-calculated to insure an efficient and responsible job of policy-making by the state legislature. Of course, no procedural mechanism is a fool proof panacea. Nevertheless, particularly in the postwar years, the legislative council appears to have met a real need of state legislators. As the Advisory Council for Iowa Economic Studies points out in a recent report:

> The legislators themselves are the main customers for the services of a legislative council. They have first claim on the time and abilities of the council staff. The legislative council operates as a service agency for the legislature as a whole. Its primary purpose is to help the members of the legislature to do a more effective job of policy-making, based on sound sources of unbiased information.
>
> Thus, the chief values of a legislative council are *educational* and *informational.* A legislative council helps to make research findings immediately usable by the individual legislator. The close working relationship between legislators serving on the council and the council's professional research staff guarantees that the research will be geared to the specific and immediate needs of the legislature itself. The close relationship between legislator and expert assures that the results of independent fact-finding will be put to immediate practical use.[10]

The legislative council movement took root and has its principal strength in the Midwestern states. This is significant. The average legislator in most of these states is a "citizen-legislator."[11] He is not a full-time politician or professional legislator, as may frequently be the case in large industrial states whose legislatures meet annually. The "citizen-legislator" is generally a public-spirited citizen who leaves his farm or profession for several months every two years to devote his energies and abilities to serious issues of state policy. The "citizen-legislator" needs urgently a source of reliable information. Lacking such a source, even the most conscientious legislator is forced to rely on the conflicting and often distorted reports of interested groups. No legislator has the time or resources to investigate personally the factual background on each of the issues he is asked to vote upon. He is entitled to the expert assistance that the research department of a legislative council can provide.

---

[9] This account of the origins of the Kansas legislative council is based on personal interviews with Dr. Frederic H. Guild, director of research for the Kansas Legislative Council since its inception in 1933, and with Mr. Sam Wilson. Wilson reasoned that the legislature would produce an improved product if there were some agency to provide continuous deliberative action between legislative sessions and which could do some objective fact-finding on problems coming before the next legislature. Wilson stumped the state in favor of the council plan. Local Chambers supported it and considerable grass roots sentiment was built up before the bill was introduced.

[10] Advisory Council for Iowa Economic Studies, *Helping Iowa's Legislature,* mimeographed (Ames, 1952). This report deals with the need for establishment of a legislative council in Iowa. It is a revision of an earlier report along similar lines by the Advisory Council, published in May, 1950. The writer of this article did the basic research on which both Advisory Council reports are based.

[11] This term should be credited to Mr. Herbert Wiltsee, Southern Representative for the Council of State Governments.

II. ORGANIZATION AND POWERS OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS

The size and composition of a council will be determined in most cases by such factors as the total number of legislators, political representation, joint composition, and area representation. Both large and small councils have their respective merits. A council should be large enough to be reasonably representative of the legislature as a whole. However, it should not be so large as to militate against effective deliberative work. Approximately 15 to 20 members would appear to satisfy these considerations in most states.

The question of the size of the council requires attention to the most significant recent organizational development in this field. Three states now make every legislator a member of the legislative council.[12] In each case, the move appears to have been made by supporters of the council idea to mollify legislators who were resentful at not being named to the council. It is questionable whether such appeasement was either necessary or desirable.[13] Perhaps, however, it is too early to pass judgment on the merits of this organizational innovation.

The arguments for and against the new system in Oklahoma have been set forth in temperate fashion by O'Rourke as follows:

> Advantages of the new system are many. All legislators now participate in council work, thus dispelling any ill feeling which may have developed under the former plan. The "Super legislature" criticism can no longer be made. The new council offers an opportunity for all members of the legislature to participate in the study and investigation of legislative problems. This council activity will serve to educate and inform the legislator so that he may better perform his policy-making function when the legislature meets in full session.
>
> Disadvantages are present under the new system. The larger council offers problems of coordination. Coordination of activities must be worked out between the chairman of the council, the director of the council's staff and the committee chairman. There is the additional problem of an increased budget. Under the Oklahoma plan, members of the council receive a mileage allowance as well as their regular pay as legislators. The large council also needs increased staff services to meet its activities. To date these problems have not proven serious and apparently the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.[14]

---

[12] Nebraska, with a unicameral legislature, changed to this practice in 1951. Oklahoma revised its law in 1949. South Dakota made all legislators members of the council when it first established a legislative research council in 1951.

[13] Dr. Jack Rhodes, director of research for the Oklahoma Legislative Council, advised the writer that if the Oklahoma Council had not been expanded in 1949 to include all members of the legislature, the council law would probably have been repealed. However, Dr. Rhodes feels that the expanded membership has been "highly beneficial" as far as Oklahoma is concerned. Council appropriations have increased substantially in recent sessions as a direct result of increased legislative confidence in the council and gratifying interim participation by virtually every member of the legislature, according to Dr. Rhodes. (Letter to the writer, April 17, 1953.)

[14] Lawrence O'Rourke, *Legislative Assistance* (cited in n. 4), pp. 13–14.

In considering the *powers* assigned by statute to legislative councils in the various states, it is desirable to review the controversy over "recommending" councils versus "fact-finding only" councils. Opinion on this question is still divided among professional students of the legislative council movement. However, most newly-created councils are of the "recommending" type.

An alternative type that merits serious consideration is one that leaves the submission of recommendations to the discretion of the council. A permissive statute gives the council enough flexibility to enable it to "feel" its way in response to the wishes of the legislators themselves. The council is not required to submit a legislative program nor to accompany all research reports with policy recommendations. On the other hand, the council is not prohibited from making recommendations when it feels they are appropriate.

A permissive statute appears to be a desirable compromise in any state where fears are expressed about the legislative council's becoming a "super-legislature." Also, it must be remembered that perhaps the chief values in the legislative council plan lie in the research assistance phase, whether or not recommendations accompany research findings. Nevertheless, the writer has concluded that the maximum potential of the legislative council mechanism is not achieved unless the council itself assumes the responsibility for formulating policy recommendations to the legislature.

Kansas and Pennsylvania may be cited as illustrative of the "recommending" type. Missouri and Illinois are representative of the "fact-finding only" type. Persuasive arguments may be advanced for each type. In favor of the "recommending" type are the following considerations:

1. Legislative council members take more direct and sustained interest in the work of the research staff if they must "take a stand" after research on a problem has been completed. Council members have a keener sense of participation and show more interest in sub-committee assignments.
2. Where research reports are submitted without any policy stand by the legislative council, meetings of the council may be routine and perfunctory. Less effective use of research will be made. Many excellent reports may go unnoticed because the council members do not have the interest to see that these reports are read and used by other legislators.
3. The real values in close collaboration between the "citizen-legislator" and the research staff are not maximized if the council member does not have to take a stand.
4. Experience has shown that the fears of giving the council the power to recommend are largely groundless. In no case where the council recommends legislation has the council become a super-legislature. The high percentage of acceptance of council bills is not attributable to undue influence from the council. Rather it is due to a recognition by the legislature as a whole that council bills are based on thorough research followed by thorough discussion.

In support of the "fact-finding only" type of council, the following considerations may be advanced:

1. The development of an efficient and unbiased research service for the legislature is the principal value inherent in the legislative council device. The advance planning and recommending functions of the legislative council have been overrated by their supporters.
2. A council that confines itself to the submission of research reports without recom-

mendations need have no fear of being charged with an interest in usurping legislative power.

3. When the power to recommend is exercised, there is a constant danger that undesirable political considerations will be introduced. This may raise doubts as to the integrity and accuracy of the council's factual reporting to the legislature.

4. In states with frequently shifting party majorities, council recommendations made in advance of the next legislative session might become those of the minority party after November elections. Such contingencies might ultimately discredit the legislative council device and serve to obscure the real values of the objective factual investigation preceding the formation of policy recommendations.

A growing feeling can be noted on the part of legislators generally, whether members of the council or not, that the council's research and study assignment is not completed until the council announces conclusions or at least sets forth alternative policy suggestions on the matters that the council has been studying.[15] In practice, a substantial majority of legislative councils do submit legislative recommendations together with research reports.[16] The percentage in favor of the "recommending" type appears likely to increase over the next few years.

To facilitate their research work, most councils are empowered to enlist cooperation and support from other state agencies. Many councils have the power to subpoena witnesses and to hold hearings.

III. OBJECTIONS TO THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL IDEA

In the history of the legislative council movement only one state, Michigan, has ever repealed its law establishing a legislative council.[17] One other state, Rhode Island, never appropriated funds to activate its council. With these two exceptions, the council movement has had a steady and successful growth. Nevertheless, in states that have not yet adopted this device vigorous objections are still heard. Among the principal objections are these:

1. The legislative council would become a super-legislature. It would derogate from the proper authority of the legislature as a whole. The legislature would be run by a powerful small clique of council members.
2. A legislative council is an unnecessary and expensive luxury. It will cost more than it is worth.
3. Special interim committees can do a better job on problems requiring attention between legislative sessions than can a legislative council.
4. Only a favored few will benefit from the facilities of a legislative council's research staff. The needs of the individual legislator will be ignored. His requests for service may go unheeded or be screened out by the legislative council.

---

[15] Authority for this observation is Mr. Herbert Wiltsee. Recent correspondence with legislative council personnel in a number of states that appear to be moving gradually toward the "recommending" type council confirms his observation.

[16] According to the Council of State Governments, legislative councils in the following states submit policy recommendations to their legislatures: Alabama, Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

[17] Kentucky repealed its original council law in 1948, but immediately enacted a new legislative council law at the same session.

5. Legislative council bills will get special attention by standing committees. They will monopolize the attention of the legislature. The individual legislator who has worked hard to prepare his own bills will find that they are ignored by the legislature in favor of council bills.

These objections are serious. If any one or combination of them is supported by experience, a state would be well-advised to think twice before adopting such a proposal. In appraising their validity, we can properly turn to the experience in legislative council states.

Will a legislative council become a super-legislature? The super-legislature charge against a legislative council has been raised initially in almost every state when the council proposal was first under consideration. Some councils have had considerable opposition on this score during their early years. Nevertheless, experience in council states rather conclusively refutes the validity of the charge.

No governmental body is more jealous of its rights and prerogatives than a legislative assembly. The fastest way for a newly-established legislative council to commit suicide would be to provide some substance to the fear that it might become a super-legislature. Extensive personal correspondence on this matter shows that in most cases the legislative council proceeds with great caution and circumspection in presenting its reports and recommendations to the legislature as a whole. Certainly, tact and diplomacy are called for at all times. Willingness to cooperate with legislative standing committees and with individual legislators must be clearly evidenced.

Above and beyond these common-sense considerations, it is also worth noting that there are many inherent safeguards in the legislative council device that preclude effectively the council's becoming a super-legislature even if it be hypothecated that the council should have such a desire. These safeguards include the following:

1. Most legislative councils are by nature "lame duck" committees, appointed out of an expiring legislature. It is difficult for "lame ducks" to behave tyrannically even if they were disposed to do so.
2. The bulk of the council's work is done *between* rather than during sessions of the legislature. The council's reports and recommendations are completed before the start of the legislative session. Many councils do not operate as councils during the actual legislative session.
3. Acceptance or rejection of the council's work depends on the quality and thoroughness of the research by the council's staff and the basic value of the council's recommendations. The only *procedural* advantage that council bills enjoy is their early submission. The only *substantive* advantage that council bills may have is a more solid evidential foundation based on the research preceding the formulation of council recommendations. The fact remains that once council bills are introduced, they are "on their own" in company with hundreds of individual legislator bills.
4. Council recommendations are accompanied in all cases by research findings stating the factual background. The council's report provides factual and analytical ammunition for *both* sides of whatever policy issue is under consideration. Thus, individual legislators who may be opposed for policy reasons to the council's recommendations can find reliable factual support for their own views in the council's research report. This is a far cry, in the writer's judgment, from a super-legislature ramming unwanted legislation down the

throats of helpless legislators. If council reports did not contain both sides of the picture on every subject considered, the justifiable outcry from the legislature would eliminate the council device in short order.

5. Finally, the normally heavy turnover rate among state legislators makes it extremely unlikely that any legislative council could become a small band of willful men obstinately set on running the legislature.

It cannot be denied that a legislative council, under some circumstances, *might* become a super-legislature. However, it is doubtful that the council movement would have made such rapid progress in recent years if there were any real evidential basis for these super-legislature fears. The writer has examined council research reports from some 20 states. These reports in general reflect thoroughness and fairness in research and analysis. In most of the reports examined by the writer there was ample "ammunition" for both sides of the policy question reported upon.

In the final analysis, experience does not appear to support the super-legislature charge. The "recommending" council, the only type against which the charge could possibly be made, is in the ascendancy within the council movement. Nearly all the newer councils are of the recommending type. There appears to be neither a logical nor an evidential basis to support the fears of those who feel that the council device constitutes a grab for undue power and influence.

Is a legislative council too costly? State legislatures currently appear to be economy-minded. There is strong objection to any measure involving new appropriations and a tendency to require proof that a new service will be in a sense self-liquidating. The history of the legislative council movement shows that most councils began with severely limited appropriations, demonstrated their worth, and have had their appropriations increased to correspond with increasing demands for their services. Table II shows appropriations for legislative councils for the 1951–53 biennium.

A legislative council is a device to improve the quality of the legislative product. It would therefore be incorrect to estimate the value of its service to the legislature and the state on a dollars and cents basis. Improved legislative understanding of key policy questions rather than cost savings should be the more important consideration. However, because of the virility of this cost argument, the writer has made inquiry among legislative councils as to specific savings effected as a direct consequence of council research reports. Among the examples of direct cost savings attributable to council research activity, the following may be cited:

1. In one midwestern state, a research study on travel and mileage expenses of public employees resulted in an annual saving of approximately $100,000.
2. In the same state, a research study of highway department economies necessary to retain federal matching aid was directly responsible for avoiding the loss of that aid.
3. In another midwestern state, a council research study prevented a costly and unnecessary expenditure in connection with the state's mental health program.
4. In a western state, a council research study on plans for a new heating plant at the state university resulted in a different approach to the problem than that originally contemplated. The direct saving here was estimated at $500,000.

TABLE II. LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS: 1951–1953 APPROPRIATIONS*

State	1951–53 Appropriations for Council and Research Service	State	1951–53 Appropriations for Council and Research Service
Alabama	$ 86,500	New Hampshire	10,000
Arkansas	81,200[a]	New Mexico	50,000
Connecticut	42,750	North Dakota	40,000[a]
Florida	102,500	Ohio	100,000
Illinois	98,040[a]	Oklahoma	100,000[c]
Indiana	85,750	Pennsylvania	250,000[d]
Kansas	145,000[a]	South Carolina	100,875[b]
Kentucky	150,000[a,b]	South Dakota	25,000
Louisiana	†	Texas	104,000[a]
Maine	88,748	Utah	40,000
Maryland	80,000[b]	Virginia	35,760[a,e]
Missouri	190,000[a]	Washington	100,000[f]
Minnesota	106,800	Wisconsin	66,000[a]
Nebraska	75,885	Wyoming	25,000
Nevada	39,041		

* Table adapted from data supplied by the Council of State Governments.

† No information available.

[a] Excludes earmarked appropriations for special studies or other specified purposes.

[b] 1950–52 biennium.

[c] Includes $20,000 for Legislative Audit Committee.

[d] 1949–51 biennium.

[e] Plus $63,990 for Division of Statutory Research and Drafting.

[f] Council does not receive direct appropriation. This is amount budgeted out of total legislative expense appropriation item.

These cases illustrate the constant potential for more economical and efficient government inherent in legislation based on solid, factual investigation. At this point it may be advisable to suggest that many states have found the legislative council to be a viable and relatively inexpensive alternative to annual sessions.

Can interim committees do a better job than a legislative council? Some legislators oppose the legislative council as unnecessary. They contend that interim committees can do a more effective job. Here again experience appears to refute the charge. Existence of a council does not eliminate interim committees. However, a legislative council can reduce the need for interim research assignments to *ad hoc* committees. The legislative council's research arm can perform many assignments more efficiently and less expensively than can *ad hoc* interim committees. However, in any state the need for special interim committees on highly technical or complex questions will arise periodically.

Council reports are likely to be more understandable to the average legislator than the more technical reports of interim committees, usually prepared by outside specialists. Also, experience in council states indicates that legislators are likely to make greater and more immediate use of legislative council reports than of interim committee reports.

Dr. Guild offers an interesting analysis of the comparative cost of research studies by legislative councils and special interim committees. He writes:

> We figured in Kansas that our interim committees, omitting one of the larger committees with a particularly high appropriation, had been costing the state $15,000 per subject studied. In the first eight years' operation of the Kansas legislative council, the average cost per subject was $1,500, and not only did no one feel that the subjects were less well covered, but in certain instances they thought the council gave better coverage.[18]

Some research jobs are too big or too specialized for a legislative council's small research unit to handle. In such cases, an *ad hoc* interim committee is necessary. For the greater number of interim research assignments, however, the legislative council and its research arm can do the job better, more quickly, and more economically than can interim committees with part-time research personnel.

Will the needs of individual legislators be ignored? Will legislative council bills get all the attention? Although the criticisms implied in these questions are rather commonly heard, little evidential support was found for them in the council states surveyed. Council bills *do* get attention. Such attention is usually favorable because of two rather obvious considerations: (1) council bills are based on independent research and are likely to be carefully thought out; and (2) council recommendations usually deal with major issues of policy requiring legislative action.

Council bills appear to enjoy a high rate of acceptance in most states. However, one should not conclude that bills by individual legislators are ignored. On the contrary, many legislators benefit from council research staff services in preparation of individual bills. Furthermore, if individual legislators wish to introduce legislation in opposition to a recommendation by the legislative council, they can frequently find factual support for their position in the research report accompanying the council's own bill.

In this writer's judgment, many legislators who raise either or both of these objections have an imperfect understanding of the manner in which a legislative council customarily operates. A council is designed to serve *all* members of the legislature, not council members alone. Council research reports (and recommendations where made) are circulated to all members of the legislature and, in many cases, to interested citizens outside the legislature. Legislative council activity is not confidential or secret. Furthermore, to the extent that manpower permits, the research needs of individual legislators are met. Admittedly, the legislative council functions as a screening committee on research requests and makes priorities in assignments to its research staff. Since the council's research arm is usually small, the need for screening and research priorities should be obvious.

More experienced members of state legislatures without legislative councils are occasionally prone to deprecate the council idea. They know the "ins and outs" of legislative procedure, and where to go for information they need.

---

[18] Personal letter to writer, March 22, 1952.

Furthermore, they may regard the council and its reports as a threat to established power blocs in the legislature. Yet in states where legislative councils have been established, the experienced legislators are likely to be more appreciative of the agency's research facilities than are the newer members of the legislature.[19]

CONCLUSION

In summary evaluation of the objections to the legislative council device discussed in this report, it can fairly be said that in general they are not supported by experience in council states. It is highly significant that the legislative council has continued to gain favor as a mechanism for improving the legislative product, particularly in recent years.

On balance, the chief contributions of the legislative council device appear to have been these:

1. Council research reports have helped to raise the informational level in state legislative assemblies, thus contributing substantially to an improved legislative product.
2. By coordinated research activity between legislative sessions, councils have facilitated the prompt and thorough treatment of major issues of state policy.
3. The council, through its research activity and deliberative action, has contributed to muting the impact of undesirable pressure group activity on individual legislators. The "citizen-legislator" is no longer forced to make his own discounting of the competing claims of professional lobbyists. He has his own source of reliable, unbiased information.
4. In states where the council makes recommendations on major policy issues in advance of the legislative session, the early and thorough consideration by the legislature of such measures is facilitated. The labors of the council and its research arm *between* sessions help to alleviate the "log jam" conditions so common in states without annual sessions and without legislative councils.

The foregoing analysis of the legislative council movement supports the Council of State Governments' conclusion that the legislative council is properly regarded as the "most significant development in the legislative service agency field during the past twenty years."[20]

---

[19] This point is stressed by Arthur Y. Lloyd, Director of the Kentucky Legislative Research Commission, in a letter to the writer, March 30, 1953.

[20] Council of State Governments, *The Book of the States, 1952–53* (Chicago, 1952), p. 115.

INCREASING THE NUMBER OF AMERICANS POTENTIALLY AVAILABLE FOR FOREIGN ASSIGNMENTS*

WALTER H. C. LAVES
Governmental Affairs Institute

The purpose of this paper is to inquire what contribution American political science can make to the easing of the shortage of competent manpower for assignments abroad.

The problem is, of course, not peculiar to the United States except in respect to its magnitude. Nearly every country with major responsibilities involving the assignment of personnel abroad is faced with it. On a world scale the United Nations, especially with respect to the Expanded Technical Assistance Program, is facing difficulties in searching out individuals who are competent, willing, and available. This was forcefully revealed by a study the author recently made for all the specialized agencies on behalf of the Technical Assistance Board. It appears to be a characteristic of our times that not enough men and women have been trained to deal competently with the kinds of problems with which we are faced in intensified intercultural relations. Thus, while this discussion will deal chiefly with the problem of increasing the American personnel potentially available for foreign assignments—something with which American political scientists need to be urgently concerned—we must avoid losing sight of the broader world setting of the problem. As the market of recruitment is world-wide for many areas of "foreign" and "international" work, so the means selected to increase the supply for the market should be as nearly world-wide as practicable.

Again, lest we fall into another kind of parochialism, it is essential to remember that political science is but one of the intellectual resources involved in helping to solve the problem. Whatever initiatives political scientists take must, of course, be related to, and coordinated with, the special initiatives of many other groups, including particularly our colleagues in other social sciences, history, education, linguistics and the humanities.

The solution of the problem under discussion, whether on a world basis or in the United States alone, will not come quickly, though a host of emergency efforts will be required and undertaken to meet immediate crises.

It is not intended to deal directly with the special problems of recruitment and training peculiar to the career Foreign Service. Rather, our special concern is with the more general needs for personnel in specialized mission assignments abroad. Any progress made in solving the more general problem will, of course, also ease the Foreign Service problem. No pretense is made that all the issues have been raised, and obviously only some solutions have been suggested.

---

* This paper was prepared as a basis for a panel discussion at the American Political Science Association's annual meeting held in Buffalo, New York, 1952. It is reproduced here, with a few minor changes, because it points to a major problem facing the United States government in which political scientists have a special concern and responsibility. Acknowledgment is gratefully made to John B. Robinson, Foreign Operations Administration, for assistance in preparing the paper.

Nature of the Problem. The essence of the manpower shortage with which we are concerned here is not people but *competence* and *availability* of people. This shortage of competent and available people for work involving assignments abroad has been recognized from the earliest days when men were sent to represent their cities, states, countries, or commercial enterprises abroad. It has continued to be a problem of modern governments relating to both colonial and foreign relations. The United States has given concentrated attention to it only sporadically, and for the most part only when the development of the Foreign Service has been involved.

The shortage has become more noticeable and actually acute in the United States with the rapid expansion of American commitments abroad and the mounting direct participation of the United States in international relations. In this respect, the problem for the United States is a direct result of the combination of two factors: (1) a long period of isolation which has left its mark upon thinking about current issues of foreign policy and international relations, and upon our entire educational process, which still fails to provide adequate world orientation; and (2) the precipitate manner in which the United States has been placed in a central world position.

Today the need for more competently trained American personnel is found in the staffing of several kinds of activities:

1. The United Nations and specialized agency programs, and particularly in the Expanded Technical Assistance Program.
2. United States government missions, including:
    a. The regular Foreign Service and Foreign Service Reserve assignments;
    b. Point IV and similar technical assistance programs in economically underdeveloped countries requiring particularly functional specialists;
    c. Special emergency and temporary programs such as the Mutual Security program, which again require principally functional specialists, but which relate to both economically underdeveloped countries and to many of the more industrialized countries.
    d. Military agency programs involving large-scale installations abroad and requiring U. S. personnel of various ranks and services.
3. Non-governmental organization programs, both national and international, in the fields of education, religion, science, etc.
4. Commercial enterprises involving installations and operations in other countries.

The number of persons involved in these activities has increased tremendously, even leaving out of account figures for military personnel. It is estimated for the United States government that about 35,000 to 40,000 civilian Americans are now variously engaged abroad in foreign countries. The United Nations and the specialized agencies employ a regular secretariat staff of 8,600, 20% of whom are U. S. nationals. In addition to the experts which these organizations normally send on missions, the need for experts under the expanded Technical Assistance program of the United Nations in the year 1953 is expected to reach about 2,160, 25% of whom would be U. S. nationals.

Qualifications Lacking. Experience in recruiting Americans for assignments abroad, whether for the United States government service, for private business, or for United Nations agencies, has revealed a lack of background and training in the following principal respects: (1) knowledge of the country or region of potential assignment; (2) language of the country of potential assignment; (3) sensitivity to cultural differences and awareness of their importance to the effectiveness of work abroad; (4) psychological preparation for living and working outside one's own country and culture; (5) technical competence applicable to the needs of other countries; and (6) recognition of the challenge involved in working on assignments abroad.

How to increase the number of Americans with these necessary qualifications is a problem worthy of the attention of political scientists. The availability of competent personnel is a condition for the successful functioning of governmental and international programs and processes. The absence of competent personnel not only is a hazard to good administration, but is also an actual danger to the international relationships and position of the United States.

Looked at in its proper perspective, this problem derives from the scope and orientation of our educational systems. These have not been able to keep abreast of the rapidly changing world conditions and have therefore failed to train and orient students adequately during their passage through school, college, or university. Today, with new and far-flung responsibilities of world-wide significance, the United States—though not the United States alone—is therefore lacking in personnel to carry out its tasks. The remedy must be sought essentially in concentrated and long-range educational efforts.

Stop-gap Orientation Programs. A number of special efforts have been made by both international and United States agencies to fill the gap resulting from inadequacies in educational preparation. The record of these efforts goes back now for a number of years, and particularly to the beginning of the last war. The kinds of programs that have been developed in this country have recently been described in detail by Wallace Sayre and Clarence Thurber in a monograph entitled, "Training for Specialized Mission Personnel," prepared under the auspices of the Public Administration Clearing House. Here are outlined the kinds of special programs developed by UNRRA, military government, the United Nations, the U. S. Foreign Service Institute, and other agencies. Private business engaged in overseas operations has also developed intensive educational programs, some of which are described in the Sayre-Thurber monograph. For many years religious and other voluntary organizations have devoted great time and energy to briefing and orientation.

Briefing and orientation programs constitute today one of the major current concerns of all governmental and United Nations agencies engaged in sending staff to other countries. While varying in quality and scope, these programs are designed to provide not only technical and administrative briefing, but also a broad background and introduction to different cultures.[1] All of these orientation efforts are attempts through intensive programs to provide what should, to a large extent, have been in the educational background of the persons recruited. At the very least, the educational programs should have provided a broader background against which briefing and orientation could more quickly take place.

---

[1] Reference to these is made in the author's report to the chairman of the Technical Assistance Board, referred to above, and in a forthcoming report, to be published by UNESCO (1954) on a UN-UNESCO Conference on Social Aspects of Technical Assistance, organized for the United Nations agencies by the author in March–April, 1953.

One obvious weakness of stop-gap programs is the pressure under which they must be conducted. For individuals going out under technical assistance programs, for example, the time devoted today to briefing and orientation very rarely exceeds four weeks and is generally less. Last-minute preparations for departure further increase the pressure for those concerned.

More serious is the frequent non-receptivity of the mind to being briefed, and the lack of a basic quality of human sympathy and understanding. These are obstacles difficult to overcome in intensive programs, no matter how much time is allowed. They relate to the entire previous educational experience which it is hard to supplement adequately or change. Qualities that should be conditions for selection are not easily developed after selection has taken place. The fact that people with adequate educational backgrounds are hard to find, combined with the pressure upon agencies to get programs under way, usually leads to the sacrifice of other necessary qualities in favor of technical competence and availability.

At its very best, therefore, briefing and orientation is a stop-gap emergency action and cannot take the place of more basic orientation through longer range and more systematic educational processes.

Improved Selection Procedures Needed. For the sake of completeness it should be noted that a part of the problem of securing more satisfactory personnel is development of better recruitment and selection procedures. This goes beyond the scope of the current discussion; yet it is clear that progress in this respect would undoubtedly uncover new sources of suitable talent and would materially reduce the orientation task. The inquiry now going on under joint auspices of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, the Department of State, and the Foreign Operations Administration promises to provide new guides for selection procedures.

The Role of Educational Institutions. Intensive area study programs have received a great deal of attention; indeed, in terms of the problem of providing skilled persons for assignments abroad, this has been the field of greatest concentrated effort. These programs, under way at many leading educational institutions with generous assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York, have produced many gratifying results. Some of the programs have been designed particularly to fill gaps in selected fields of study. Others have sought to fill particular administrative needs of the Foreign Service, the intelligence services, and the military services.

There appears to be need for much greater coordination of area programs, and we need to explore what can be done to fill gaps which still exist. Special attention to relating these area programs to other social science courses would greatly increase their usefulness and would help meet the problems outlined below. Certainly such programs are one answer to an immediate and pressing need. They also lay necessary foundations for future training of American personnel resources of a more general character. Important as these area programs and similar concentrated efforts to develop specialists are, however, they are directed at one segment only (albeit a very important one) of the greater problem we face today.

Another significant educational development in this connection is the attempt made during recent years to improve the teaching of international relations. One thinks immediately of the efforts under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment and the Brookings Institution. Efforts of this kind—and there are many underway in a wide variety of institutions—necessarily increase the number of better trained people who are potentially available for public and private service abroad. Again, some are designed to reach another kind of specialist, but one aim is to reach a large proportion of students in secondary schools and colleges.

Directly related to the problem of increasing the number of persons potentially available for service abroad, although frequently overlooked and generally not recognized as of crucial importance, are the attempts to increase world orientation through general education at the secondary school and college levels. The term "general education" is used to describe the content of educational programs provided at the secondary school and college levels, without direct intent to provide technical or professional specialists. Continuing and increasing efforts to include world orientation at this level of education is basic to achieving effective progress in solving the manpower shortage with which we are here concerned.

The world in which modern college and secondary-school graduates will live and function is obviously very different from that in which most of our basic educational requirements were developed. The requirements for general education must continually be adjusted to these changes. The curricula of most educational institutions, secondary and college, tend to lag far behind the times. Failure to provide adequate world orientation is doubly dangerous. It leads to a shortage of leadership and competent manpower when these are most needed. It also prevents, through want of public understanding, sufficiently quick adjustment in policy and action to new economic, political, and social world relationships. In short, it tends to prevent a clear view of the national interest and of the needs for promoting the general welfare.

The general educational process of secondary schools and colleges is an important element in providing citizens with their knowledge, attitudes, and motivations for work and participation in life. While other environmental factors also condition the citizen, the educational process is the chosen instrument of society for this purpose.

What is done by secondary and college programs to prepare the citizen for living and for working in the radically changing world community bears directly on the problem of availability of personnel for foreign assignments. We have been giving far too little attention to providing the student as a citizen with the knowledge, attitudes, and motivations that will permit him to function in the greater community within which his nation exists. This applies to both the professional specialist and the non-professional student.

The major problem is not to train students for overseas assignments alone. Indeed, this is an especially important fact to underline. The uncertainties of employment, especially in international programs, are so great and the magnitude of the need for personnel so generally undefined, that it would be a mistake to start training on a large scale a group of persons exclusively prepared for this kind of work. Moreover, it is likely to remain true that a professional person is not wanted for work abroad until he has been successful at home. The fortunes of individual careers, family responsibilities among other things, are so unpredictable that it is impossible to know whether a man will in fact be ready and able to go abroad. The demand for experts, today at least, is for people who have proven their professional competence, and not for those fresh out of professional schools.

At this level, therefore, the task of education is not one of training directly for foreign work so much as it is to provide a broader base for the general citizen and professional man so that he may be able to take on assignments elsewhere if these develop. Incidentally, in the case of the United States, it is very likely that we shall continue to rely heavily upon non-professional foreign service personnel to supplement a small corps of Foreign Service Officers.

In considering the importance of world orientation as a part of general education, it is worth recalling that one important phase in the administration of foreign affairs abroad—indeed, the phase that will involve sending the largest number of Americans abroad—is the deployment of American troops in foreign countries. This is no passing phenomenon, if one may be permitted a guess. For this purpose, Americans are not and will not be selected because of special qualifications for service abroad, and least of all for their knowledge, attitudes, and motivations on matters of international affairs. Briefing and orientation in the armed services is not likely to be much better than in the civilian services—although considerable improvements have been made in this respect, notably since the creation of NATO and SHAPE. But the impact of hundreds of thousands of American military personnel abroad is a major factor affecting the attainment of the entire range of United States foreign policy objectives. Practically all of this military personnel goes through some portion of the general educational process and should be provided with world orientation in the areas in which gaps have been noted to exist at present among specialists recruited for overseas service.

An equally important consideration in support of including basic world orientation within general programs of education is that it is the non-professional citizen with no probable foreign assignment who finally provides the conditions and authority for most such activities. He is the voter and the taxpayer, who must understand and approve the policy and administration of our foreign affairs. In the communities of the United States, he sets the tone and attitude of public opinion against the background of which government recruits for service abroad. From his number come most of the legislators who must provide the approval for and the condition of employment in overseas work. In many respects, and at many times, the general citizen's knowledge, attitudes, and motivations are crucial to finding and maintaining competent people for foreign assignments.

It is beyond the scope of this discussion to suggest the precise content of programs which would provide knowledge, attitudes, and motivations required for competent service of Americans abroad. Previously we have listed some of the main gaps revealed in the qualifications of persons selected by government. By different means, the approaches suggested for educational institutions should seek to fill these gaps. There are in addition some specific educational efforts which might usefully be made to assist in finding and in training adults interested in assignments abroad today.

One matter seems to merit special mention because of its basic importance to the future of American participation in world affairs. Far more attention needs to be given to the revision of present language training programs in order to develop language as a useful tool rather than a system of units of instruction to which the student is exposed. Great progress has been made in the improvement of language teaching during the last ten years, but we are still a long way from making these improvements available to the average secondary school, college and university student. As a consequence, we continue to be handicapped as a nation in conducting our relations with people of other countries.

Role of Political Scientists. Political scientists, by the scope and nature of their professional interest, seem to have a special responsibility to assist in increasing the number of competently prepared Americans available for service abroad. Their role in educational institutions naturally gives them special opportunities to encourage both area studies and more adequate programs in the field of international relations. But most significantly, their assistance is required in an intensive effort to raise the general level of public understanding concerning the implications for our welfare of the fundamental alterations in economic, political, and social relationships that have occurred in the modern world. The increased need for competent personnel to represent the United States abroad or to serve the United Nations, business organizations, and other private undertakings, are all consequences of these changes. The personnel needed for this purpose requires knowledge, attitudes and motivations consistent with these circumstances. Whether these qualifications are provided by our educational media will depend in no small measure upon the degree of initiative taken in this regard by political scientists.

THE INDEPENDENT VOTER IN 1952: A STUDY OF PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS*

PHILIP K. HASTINGS
Williams College

A challenging problem for both the student of political behavior and the practical politician is the self-labeled independent voter. Much of the research on what appears to be an increasingly larger segment of the American electorate has been either historically or sociologically oriented in the sense that it has focused on trend studies of the voting pattern of this group or has attempted to describe it in terms of its objective characteristics.[1] Frequently, by inference at least, we are led to believe that the future political behavior of the independent can be anticipated if we have information of the above nature. The central purpose of this article is to present evidence favoring the hypothesis that the political behavior of the independent is more closely related to relevant psychological variables, such as his political perceptions, than to his past voting habits or his objective attributes.

During the period from April through November of 1952, the author directed a detailed study of the political opinions and behavior of the residents of Pittsfield, Massachusetts, a city of approximately 53,000 people. The research methods employed in the project included a systematic historic analysis of the community, a series of four public opinion surveys,[2] content analysis of some of the mass media of communication, and a panel study. The first poll took place late in the spring of 1952, the second in August, and the third and fourth were carried out just prior to and immediately following the November elections. The panel members, coming from a wide range of socio-economic backgrounds, were interviewed periodically throughout the course of the project. The information accumulated during these interviews has been compiled in the form of case histories.

A somewhat unusual characteristic of Pittsfield is the relatively large percentage of its adult population (about 40%) claiming to be independent politically.[3] As a result of our analysis of Pittsfield's self-identified independents, at least four conclusions were evident. First, in terms of objective or descriptive characteristics, they tended to be more like Democrats than Republicans. Second, as far as their pre-1952 voting behavior was concerned (specifically, in the 1948 and 1950 elections), the Pittsfield independents, by and large, voted with the Democrats. Third, during the 1952 campaign, the independents tended to agree with the Republicans regarding which problems the two groups perceived as being the most crucial facing this country today. Fourth, a majority of independents voted for the Republican candidate for President in last fall's election.

---

* This article presents the principal parts of a paper read by the author at the May, 1953 meetings of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, held in Pocono Manor, Pennsylvania.

[1] For an informative review of the history and present nature of research on the independent voter, the reader is referred to Samuel J. Eldersveld, "The Independent Vote: Measurement, Characteristics, and Implications for Party Strategy," this REVIEW, Vol. 46, pp. 732–53 (Sept., 1952).

In Table I, it will be noted that the Democrats and independents agree most closely on the dimensions of age and economic status. Regarding educational attainment, occupation, and religious affiliation, there is less agreement between the two groups, but even on these counts, the independents tend to be more like those individuals affiliated with the Democratic party. It is interesting to note the main exception to this trend. On the basis of thirteen factual questions dealing with current events and people on the political scene, the independents and Republicans scored significantly higher than the Democrats. For the Republican voters, this result might well be a reflection of their relatively higher educational level. In the case of the independents, their comparatively high information score is possibly an indication of their greater sensitivity to and interest in political matters.

The apparent similarity between the independents and the Democrats is evident not only from the factual characteristics which have been considered thus far, but is revealed again when one examines the voting records of the three political groups in the 1948 and the 1950 elections. It will be noted in Table II that in the presidential election of 1948, many more of Pittsfield's current independents voted for Truman than for Dewey. The same voting pattern is evident in the Massachusetts gubernatorial race of 1950. It should

---

[2] Sample sizes and confidence limits:

Survey	Sample size	Confidence limits .95	Confidence limits .99
April	362	11%	14%
August	222	14	17
October	217	14	17
November	198	14	18

Survey estimate (October) of the vote compared with the actual vote:

	Estimated	Actual
President:		
Eisenhower	54%	53.4%
Stevenson	46	46.6
Senator:		
Lodge	55%	53.2%
Kennedy	45%	46.8
Governor:		
Herter	61%	57.7%
Dever	39	42.3

[3] The respondents in each survey were asked the question: "Do you consider yourself a Republican, Democrat, or independent?"

TABLE I. FACE DATA CHARACTERISTICS: INDEPENDENTS, DEMOCRATS, AND REPUBLICANS*

Face Data Characteristics	Political Affiliation		
	Ind. N=162	Dem. N=109	Rep. N=91
Age:			
Under 40	38%	39%	28%
Over 40	62	61	72
Economic:			
Under $4,000 a year	55	59	39
Over $4,000 a year	45	41	61
Education:			
Grades 1–8	27	37	18
Grades 9–12	50	51	34
Part or all college	18	8	38
Other	5	4	10
Occupation:			
Labor	35	47	20
White collar	12	10	14
Management and professional	10	5	19
Housewife	32	33	42
Other	11	5	5
Religion:			
Protestant	37	14	82
Catholic	54	80	13
Jewish	6	4	1
Other	3	2	4
Sex:			
Male	58	48	44
Female	42	52	56
Level of Information:			
Low (0–6)	16	27	8
Medium (7–10)	44	54	52
High (11–13)	40	19	40

* These data were compiled from the results of Survey #1 (April, 1952). Essentially the same statistics resulted from the other three surveys conducted during the course of the study.

be clearly understood, of course, that these data result from the author's 1952 analysis of how those individuals who identified themselves as Democrats, Republicans, or independents claim to have voted in the two preceding elections. Since a similar study of Pittsfield was not undertaken in 1948 and 1950, and since the respondents were not asked if they had in the past considered themselves members of any other political group, it is not possible, for example, to say whether the particular members of our independent group in 1952 had shifted in their political allegiance from 1948 to the present. The Pittsfield data show only that a majority of the 1952 self-labeled independents said that they voted Democratic in 1948 and 1950.

In the 1952 elections, however, a majority of Pittsfield's independents voted for the Republican presidential candidate. It is evident, then, that a significant shift in the voting behavior of this group took place between 1948–1950 and 1952. If we had been attempting to foresee the voting trend of the independents this past year, and had relied upon our knowledge of the factual characteristics which define the group or our information regarding their past voting record, we would have anticipated incorrectly their behavior at the polls last November 4.

TABLE II. 1948, 1950, AND 1952 VOTING RECORD: INDEPENDENTS, DEMOCRATS, AND REPUBLICANS

	Political Affiliations		
	Ind. N=162	Dem. N=109	Rep. N=91
1948:			
Truman	67%	93%	10%
Dewey	31	7	87
Other	2	—	3
1950:			
Dever (D)	64	86	12
Coolidge (R)	30	7	84
Other	6	7	4
1952:*			
Stevenson	39	72	6
Eisenhower	57	28	92
Other	4	—	2

* The 1952 percentages are based upon the results of Survey #4, which was conducted during the third week of November. The number of cases in each breakdown was as follows: Independent 90, Democrat 53, and Republican 55.

It was our contention that the nature and extent of perceptual agreement characteristic of the three major political groups would constitute a sounder and more basic criterion against which to judge voting intention. Numerous questions, designed to specify the nature of the respondent's perception of political issues, were asked during the course of the study. Our hypothesis was that each of the three main political groups would be apt to stress differentially the various issues which were being raised and focused upon during the campaign. In other words, it was felt that there might be a characteristic pattern in what Democrats vs. Republicans vs. independents perceived as the most pressing concerns of this country today.

As might well have been predicted, the Republican voter cited internal problems of an economic and political nature considerably more often than did the Democratic voter. Our April results showed that within the Republican ranks, seven out of ten people pointed to economic problems as the most pressing difficulties facing the United States today, while but four out of ten Democrats did likewise. Among the independents, six out of ten individuals were concerned most with economic problems. The three groups emphasized to about the same degree strictly political problems.

The frequency with which foreign affairs issues were mentioned by members of the three political groups in the April sample is indicated by the following percentages: independents 90%, Republicans 83%, and Democrats 79%. Although these differences are relatively small, it is pertinent to make two observations regarding them. First, the very large number of people in all three political groups who were thinking of this country's role in international affairs should be noted. Second, these percentages show that the independents as a group are perhaps more internationally oriented than either the Republicans or the Democrats. It would not seem unreasonable to conclude, therefore, that Pittsfield's independent voter in 1952 paid particular attention to the foreign policy planks in the platforms of both the Republican and the Democratic parties.

If our central hypothesis is valid, a relatively high percentage of those independents who agreed with the Republican respondents perceptually should have translated their predispositions into a Republican vote in November. One would not expect the remaining segment of the independent group to vote Republican to as great a degree. Taking the category of economic issues as an illustration, our April survey data indicated that in Pittsfield 65% of the Republicans, 56% of the independents, and 39% of the Democrats cited economic problems as among the most crucial facing the United States today. Although the gross percentages varied from survey to survey, the ratios indicated by these figures remained relatively constant throughout the study. In November, after the elections were over, the members of our fourth survey sample were asked to cite the reasons which they felt were most important in explaining the Republican victory. Economic problems were mentioned by 45% of the Republicans, 42% of the independents, and 23% of the Democrats.

TABLE III. 1952 VOTING BEHAVIOR OF REPUBLICANS, INDEPENDENTS, AND DEMOCRATS IN RELATION TO CONCERN WITH ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

	Cited Economic Problems		Did Not Cite Economic Problems	
	Eisenhower	Stevenson	Eisenhower	Stevenson
Republican	100%	—	93%	7%
Independent	71	29%	58	42
Democrat	—	100	30	70

Table III indicates how the people in each of these three groups and their counterparts (i.e., those individuals within each of the three political groups who did not cite economic problems) actually voted. To be noted particularly are the percentages indicating the degree to which those independents who cited economic problems (in comparison to those who did not) voted Republican.

Analysis of Pittsfield's self-identified independent voters has resulted in evidence supporting the following conclusions:

1. Although in 1952 the independents tended to resemble the Democrats in sociological make-up, and although a majority of them voted Democratic in the two elections preceding 1952, as a group they demonstrated a relatively high degree of perceptual agreement with the Republicans.

2. It would seem likely that the closeness of the independents to the Republicans perceptually accounts, to a large extent, for the independents' Republican vote in November.

3. Research designed to reveal and measure the psychological variables relevant to an individual's political behavior, rather than analysis of the pertinent sociological and historical facts, may well provide a sounder basis for understanding if not predicting said behavior.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES*

COMPILED BY FRANCIS E. ROURKE

Yale University

I. DISSERTATIONS IN PREPARATION

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Gilbert Abcarian, Political Implications of Art. *California* (Berkeley).

Fred Ablin, George Plekhanov and the "Iskra" Period. *Columbia.*

Harold W. Adams, Significance and Impact of Heinrich Treitschke. *Clark.*

Justin Atkinson, The Political Thought of L. T. Hobhouse. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert D. Barendsen, The Chinese Communist Germ Warfare Propaganda, 1952–53. *Yale.*

Stanislaus Belch, Thomas Hobbes' Concept of Religion and the State's Relation to It. *Notre Dame.*

Samuel B. Bloom, Philosophic Foundations of Representative Government. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert Boynton, The Socio-Political Philosophy of George Santayana with Special Reference to His Recent Thought. *Michigan.*

---

* Similar lists have been printed in the REVIEW as follows: V, 456 (1911); VI, 464 (1912); VII, 689 (1913); VIII, 488 (1914); XIV, 155 (1920); XVI, 497 (1922); XIX, 171 (1925); XX, 660 (1926); XXI, 645 (1927); XXII, 736 (1928); XXIII, 795 (1929); XXIV, 799 (1930); XXV, 798 (1931); XXVI, 769 (1932); XXVII, 680 (1933); XXVIII, 766 (1934); XXIX, 713 (1935); XXX, 811 (1936); XXXI, 772 (1937); XXXII, 796 (1938); XXXIII, 732 (1939); XXXIV, 767 (1940); XXXV, 752 (1941); XXXVI, 734 (1942); XXXVII, 706 (1943); XXXVIII, 766 (1944); XXXIX, 779 (1945); XL, 775 (1946); XLI, 754 (1947); XLII, 759 (1948); XLIII, 787 (1949); XLIV, 689 (1950); XLV, 779 (1951); XLVI, 819 (1952).

Items which appeared in the September, 1952, list are in general classified under the same headings in the present list, and new items have been assimilated to the 1952 classification as far as possible. In cases where classification of an item has been suggested by the institution concerned, the suggestion has been followed. Each item is listed under one classification only.

The lists printed in the REVIEW are based on information from departments giving graduate instruction in political science. Often dissertations are in progress in departments of economics, history, sociology, etc., which overlap or supplement dissertations in preparation in political science. Attention is called especially to the following lists: "Current Research Projects in Public Administration" (reported to Public Administration Service), the most recent edition of which appeared in 1951; "Doctoral Dissertations in Political Economy in Progress in American Colleges and Universities," in the *American Economic Review;* "List of Doctoral Dissertations in History Now in Progress," published annually by the Division of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution through 1938, and since then by the American Historical Association, as supplements to the *American Historical Review* (1940 and 1941), as Vol. III of its *Annual Report* (1941), and as separate publications (1947 and 1949); and "Doctoral Dissertations in Sociology," in the *American Journal of Sociology.* Consult also the "External Research List," published by the Office of Intelligence Research, Department of State. These are in addition to the "List of American Doctoral Dissertations Printed in 1938," the most recent of an annual series published by the Library of Congress; and Arnold H. Trotier and Marian Harman, "Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities, 1951–52," the nineteenth of a series beginning in 1933–34, compiled for the Association of Research Libraries. Consult, for other lists, T. R. Palfrey and H. E. Coleman, Jr., "Guide to Bibliographies of Theses, United States and Canada" (Chicago, American Library Association, 2nd ed., 1940).

Abstracts of some of the theses listed as completed may be found in "Dissertation Abstracts," published bi-monthly by University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Donald W. Brandon, Liberty and the Public Interest: A Critical Analysis of the Relation between Individual Rights, Group Interests, and the General Welfare in Recent Democratic Political Theory. *California* (Berkeley).

George Brasington, Jr., Representative Government in Jacksonian Political Philosophy. *Illinois.*

Burton Brazil, Loyalty Oaths in California: Theoretical Background and Implications. *Stanford.*

William R. Brown, Deviations in American Communism: The Influence of American Politics and Economics on Communist Theory. *Washington* (St. Louis).

Francis M. Carney, Recent Development of the Concept of Representation. *California* (Los Angeles).

Karl H. Cerny, Catholic Social Thought in the United States. *Yale.*

Ross Clinchy, The State and Minority Rights. *Columbia.*

Samuel Cook, A Critique of Ethical Theories of Democracy: An Inquiry into the Logic and Value of Democracy. *Ohio State.*

David Cooperman, The Psychology and Ethics of Violence: A Study in Political Theory. *Minnesota.*

Bernard R. Crick, The Origins and Conditions of the American Science of Politics. *Harvard.*

George Demetriou, The Relationship of Political and Ethical Thought in Current American Theory. *Minnesota.*

J. Raymond Derrig, S.J., Political Thought in American Catholic Newspapers. *St. Louis.*

Susan H. Devine, The Political and Social Philosophy of Herbert Hoover. *Pennsylvania.*

Laird J. Dunbar, The Emergence and Growth of the Idea of the Compatibility of Administration and Politics in Recent American Theory and Practice. *New York University.*

David M. Earl, Political Thinking in Maiji Japan. *Columbia.*

James Eayrs, The English Agrarians: A Study of the Political and Social Thought of Spence, Ogilvie and Paine. *Columbia.*

Harry H. Eckstein, The Role of Values in Political Inquiry: A Methodological Analysis. *Harvard.*

Esther Edelman, Political Theory of Ernest Jones. *Columbia.*

Emily H. Ehle, The Identification of Local Leadership within an American City (Philadelphia). *Pennsylvania.*

James V. Elliott, The Social and Political Thought of Daniel Defoe. *Harvard.*

Frank Evans, Jr., The Political Theory of Richelieu. *Georgetown.*

Victor C. Ferkiss, The Political and Economic Philosophy of American Fascism from the Great Depression to Pearl Harbor. *Chicago.*

Edward Fishman, The Political and Social Philosophy of Owen J. Roberts. *Pennsylvania.*

Martin Fleisher, Political Theory of James Harrington. *Columbia.*

Theodore B. Fleming, Jr., John Stuart Mill's Essay *On Liberty* and Its Critics. *Yale.*

Richard D. Forster, The British Political Image of the United States. *Yale.*

Garland Fothergill, Some Elements in the Political Thought of John Dewey. *Minnesota.*

Julian Franklin, The Theory of Caesarism. *Columbia.*

Leonard Freedman, Group Opposition to Governmental Welfare Activities in the United States. *California* (Los Angeles).

Stanley T. Gabis, Secrecy in Politics: A Study in Attitudes. *Chicago.*

Alexander L. George, The Intelligence Value of Content Analysis. *Chicago.*

Robert O. Gibbon, The Relation of the State to the Economic Order in Greek and Roman Political Thought: A Study of Greek and Roman Political Thinkers. *Minnesota.*

R. Gordon Gilbert, Description and Prescription in Seventeenth Century Science. *California* (Berkeley).

Gilbert F. Gilchrist, Of Laws and Men; Political and Social Thought of James Harrington. *Johns Hopkins.*

Robert C. Good, The Contribution of Reinhold Niebuhr to International Relations. *Yale.*

Gordon B. Greb, The Political Philosophy of the American Press. *Stanford.*

John P. Green, The Philosophic Premises of Locke's Politics: The Concept of the Law of Nature. *Chicago.*

Adele Haddad, The Concept of the State in Islamic Thought. *Michigan.*

Edward Handler, The Political Theory of John Adams: A Study of the Emergence of a Conservative Tradition in American Political Thought. *Harvard.*

Norman B. Hannah, The Purpose of the State in Greek Political Theory. *Minnesota.*

Philip Haring, Lasswell's Conception of Political Science: A Critical Analysis. *Chicago.*

Heber R. Harper II, The Political Views of Certain Contemporary Religious Fundamentalists. *Michigan.*

Beresford Hayward, An Evaluation of the Program of American Labor for a Full Employment Economy as an Efficient Expression of Its Contemporary Political Philosophy. *Chicago.*

Henry J. Hodder, The Political and Social Thought of Thorstein Veblen. *Harvard.*

David Holland, The Problematic Situation as a Context for Valuation in the Writings of John Dewey. *Harvard.*

Richard L. Hough, Base Theorists of Elitist Doctrine: Their Impact on Democratic Theory. *California* (Los Angeles).

James K. Hunter, Jr., The Influence of George Bernard Shaw on Political Theory. *Ohio State.*

John K. Knaus, The Political Philosophy of John Stuart Mill. *Stanford.*

Bernard Kronick, Political Ideas of Winston Churchill. *California* (Berkeley).

Irma Lang, Swiss Federalism: Theory and Structure. *Harvard.*

Murray B. Levin, Political Theory of Thomas Hodgskin. *Columbia.*

Guenter Lewy, The Political Philosophy of Mariana. *Columbia.*

Allen McConnell, Alexander Herzen and the Revolutions of 1848. *Brown.*

Brian A. McGrath, S.J., The Basic Political Philosophy of Woodrow Wilson. *Harvard.*

Donald K. McKee, The Intellectual and Historical Influences Shaping the Political Theory of Daniel de Leon. *Columbia.*

Thomas F. Maher, Population and Politics: The Political Aspects of Birth Control. *Notre Dame.*

Serif A. Mardin, The Influence of Positivism on the Development of Turkish Political Thought in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. *Stanford.*

Lucian C. Marquis, Religious Factors in the Development of Minor Parties in the United States. *California* (Los Angeles).

Joseph O. Matthews, Benjamin Disraeli, Theorist of Toryism. *Yale.*

Edward N. Megay, Treitschke as a Political Philosopher. *Georgetown.*

James K. Melville, Brigham Young and American Political Ideas. *Utah.*

Fauzi M. Najjar, The Political Philosophy of Al-Farabi: As a Rationalistic Interpretation of Islam. *Chicago.*

Dorothy L. Noble, Francis Nicholson. *Columbia.*

Erma H. Olson, Democratic Theory and the Idea of the Managerial Revolution. *Minnesota.*

Ivan W. Parkins, John Dewey on Liberty. *Chicago.*

Stanley J. Parry, A Study of the Political Thought of Johannes Althusius as Expressed in His Politica Methodice Digesta. *Yale.*

Abelardo Patino, The Political Ideas of the Liberal and Conservative Parties in Colombia during the 1946–52 Crisis. *American.*

Frank A. Pinner, Political Values: An Empirical Approach. *California* (Berkeley).

Truman A. Potter, Some Contributions of Interest-Group Analysis to Political Theory in America, 1900–1950. *Minnesota.*

Fred Raniele, Theories of Conscientious Objectors toward War in the 16th and 17th Centuries. *Minnesota.*

William O. Reichert, Recent American Conservatism. *Minnesota.*

Philip Rieff, Freud's Contribution to Political Philosophy. *Chicago.*

Norman M. Rosenberg, The Grande Chartreuse: Studies in the Literature of Marxist Disenchantment. *Columbia.*

Gene W. Setzer, Contemporary American Ideas of Human Equality. *Columbia.*

Theodore L. Shay, The Myth of Progress with Special Reference to Its Political Implications. *Northwestern.*

Judith N. Shklar, Political Fatalism: A Study in Contemporary Political Theory. *Harvard.*

Herbert P. Shyer, The Political Philosophy of David Hume. *Harvard.*

David G. Smith, The Political Theory of V. I. Lenin: Some Fundamental Concepts as the Basis for a Systematic Critique. *Johns Hopkins.*

Robert F. Stephens, Political Theories Inherent in Selected Psychological Theories. *Michigan.*

Richard W. Sterling, Ego and Ethic in International Politics: Friedrich Meinecke and the Idea of Raison d'Etat. *Yale.*

William A. Stewart, The Political Ideas of L. T. Hobhouse. *Minnesota.*

Nathan M. Talbott, The Political Thought of T'an Ssu-T'ung. *Washington* (Seattle).

James Tierney, Laski and Bryce: A Comparative Study of Their Thoughts on American Democracy. *Brown.*

James E. Titus, Left of Center: A Study of American Liberalism in the 1930's. *Wisconsin.*

William F. Troutman, Theories of the Relationship between Church and State in America in the Period 1786–1791. *Duke.*

Charles W. Van Cleve, The Doctrine of State and Church in Roman Catholic Thought in the Twentieth Century. *Texas.*

David B. Walker, The Political Ideas of Rufus Choate. *Brown.*

John Wallerstedt, The Political Thought of Henry Jones Ford. *Georgetown.*

Victor E. Walter, The Idea of Justice in Sociological Jurisprudence. *Minnesota.*

Kenneth Waltz, The Problem of War in Western Political Thought. *Columbia.*

George Weber, Church and State in France: A Study in the Manipulation of Liens upon Political Obedience. *Virginia.*

Lloyd M. Wells, The Theoretical Defense of Big Business 1933–1953: A Study in Contemporary American Political Thought. *Princeton.*

Ruth L. Wishneff, Charles Péguy and the Crisis of the Third Republic. *Cornell.*

Robert Yee, American Liberalism, 1919–1929. *Washington* (Seattle).

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS DEPENDENCIES

Myer Alpert, Public Policy and the Pulp and Paper Industry. *Harvard.*

Cleveland Anschell, Federal Aid for Highways. *Harvard.*

Jack E. Babcock, Political Aspects of Economic Mobilization. *Georgetown.*

John W. Baker, The Theory and Practice of the Public Representative on Governmental Agencies Dealing with Conflicting Economic Interests. *California* (Berkeley).

Lucius Jefferson Barker, The Tidelands Oil Controversy: A Study in Public Policy Making. *Illinois.*

David W. Barkley, Problems of the Aging Population and the Role of Government. *Harvard.*

Robert L. Berg, Presidential Power and the Royal Prerogative. *Minnesota.*

Ray William Bronez, Interest Groups and Public Housing. *Chicago.*

Edmund Begole Brownell, A Study of the Interaction between the Department of the Treasury and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. *Michigan.*

William Buchanan, Public Opinion and Political Parties in the United States: A Statistical Analysis. *Princeton.*

Edward M. Caine, The Regulation of Commercial Aviation under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. *New York University.*

King Carr, Collective Bargaining as a Public Campaign: Steel Industry, 1945–1949. *Chicago.*

Harold W. Chase, Controlling Subversive Activities: A Case Study of the Efforts of the National Government to Control Indigenous Communists, 1932–52. *Princeton.*

Hyo Won Cho, The Evolution of RFC Functions: A Study in the Rise and Decline of an Agency. *Ohio State.*

Charles L. Clapp, The Presidential Primary in 1952. *California* (Berkeley).

Omar A. Coleman, Inter-State Trade Barriers. *Washington* (Seattle).

Paul B. Crooks, Farm Planning in Indiana. *Harvard.*

Alten Davis, Conflicts in Land Policy Between Federal and State Government. *California* (Berkeley).

James W. Davis, The Use and Effect of the Presidential Primary System. *Minnesota.*

John Thomas Dempsey, Control by Congress over the Seating and Disciplining of Its Members. *Michigan.*

Jean M. Driscoll, Candidates and Constituency: A Study of Nominations and Elections in a State Senatorial District. *Northwestern.*

Aurie N. Dunlap, The Political Career of Arthur H. Vandenberg. *Columbia.*

Nancy Ann Edwards, Congress and Administrative Reorganization. *Columbia.*

William Clinton Ellet, Jr., Federal and State Control of Atomic Cities. *Michigan.*

Thomas P. Emerich, The United States' Shipbuilding Industry and National Policy. *Georgetown.*

Richard F. Fenno, Jr., The American Cabinet: An Analysis from Wilson to Truman. *Harvard.*

Jenniellen Ferguson, Voting Behavior for President in 600+Counties in the United States, 1900–1950: A Statistical Study. *California* (Los Angeles).

Jason L. Finkle, Congress and the Atomic Energy Program: A Study in Congressional Direction and Control. *Michigan.*

James Joseph Flannery, Water Pollution Control; Development of Public Policy and Federal-State Relations. *Wisconsin.*

George Foufas, American Party Platforms—1940, 1944, 1948. *Harvard.*

Robert S. Friedman, The Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives: A Study of its Functions and Procedures. *Illinois.*

Lawrence H. Fuchs, Ethnic Voting Behavior in Boston. *Harvard.*

Gabriel Gabrelian, Voting Behavior in the United States. *Princeton.*

William C. Gibbons, Congress and the International Information Program Since the End of World War II: A Case Study in the Intellectual Role of Congress in Foreign Policy Decision-Making. *Princeton.*

Charles E. Gilbert, Representation in Congress: A Case Study. *Northwestern.*

Betty Goetz, The Foreign Affairs Program of the League of Women Voters: Formulation, Mobilization of Public Opinion, Methods of Influencing Government Action, Evaluation of Results. *Minnesota.*

Delphis C. Goldberg, Public Assistance Grants. *Harvard.*

Lyman J. Gould, The Government of Puerto Rico: From Territory to Commonwealth. *Michigan.*

Gerald John Grady, The St. Lawrence Waterway Controversies: A Study in Policy Formation. *Chicago.*

Charles J. Graham, Recent Republican Foreign Policy. *Illinois.*

Alice Greene, The Not So Supreme Court (The Supreme Court Fight of 1937). *Harvard.*

Richard C. Gripp, The Theory of Recent American Federalism. *Southern California.*

Nathan Hakman, The I.W.W.: A Study of Group Pressures in the Political Process. *Illinois.*

Bartlett E. Harvey, Public Opinion and the Formation of Foreign Policy—Three Studies. *Harvard.*

William D. Hatley, The Dixiecrat Movement. *Missouri.*

David William Hazel, The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People: A Study in the Congressional Legislative Process. *Michigan.*

Marston Headley, The Role of the States in the Administration of a National System of Public Employment Offices. *Harvard.*

Jack M. Hertzog, The Aministration of Soldier Voting in the United States Army. *American.*

Edward Heubel, The Organization and Conduct of Congressional Investigations since 1946. *Minnesota.*

Wilbur W. Hitchcock, Defense of National Honor as Justification for Military Measures. *Pennsylvania.*

Renze L. Hoeksema, United States Postwar Aid to the Philippines. *Harvard.*

Walter Hohenstein, Federal Control over Local and State Officers. *Minnesota.*

A. Freeman Holmer, An American Labor Party? An Analysis of the Causes of Labor's Political Failures, with Emphasis on the Period 1920–1948. *Columbia.*

Jack E. Holmes, Politics of National Farmers Union. *Chicago.*

Irving Howards, The Influence of Southern Senators on American Foreign Policy from 1940 to 1950. *Wisconsin.*

James Howe, The Budget and Foreign Affairs. *Harvard.*

Robert M. Hunsaker, The Politics of Public Utilities. *Minnesota.*

John E. Hutchinson, American and British Labor in Politics. *California* (Los Angeles).

Slater K. Isenberg, The Social Characteristics of Selected Areas of Non-Voting Concentration. *American.*

Fridolph Johnson, Limitations on the Scope of Presidential Power to Conclude International Agreements. *Michigan.*

Stanley Kelley, The Public Relations Counsel as Campaign Manager. *Johns Hopkins.*

Robert C. Kennedy, The Development of Labor Legislation in the Eightieth Congress (First Session). *American.*

Alan Edmond Kent, Wisconsin and Foreign Policy; Wisconsin's Senators and Representatives since World War I. *Wisconsin.*

Clifford Ketzel, Exchange of Persons and Foreign Policy. *California* (Berkeley).

Charles F. Kiefer, The Secretary of Agriculture. *Harvard.*

James A. Killough, Federal Regulation of Radio and Television Broadcasting. *Pennsylvania.*

Kenneth Kofmehl, Congressional Staffing, with Emphasis on the Professional Staff. *Columbia.*

Richard P. Kosaki, Political Beliefs in the Territory of Hawaii as Reflected in Legislative Sessions, with Special Reference to Racial and Cultural Influences. *Minnesota.*

Richard E. Lambert, INCODEL, an Instrument of Interstate Governmental Cooperation. *Rutgers.*

Lewis J. Lapham, Congressional Organization and Policy Formulation, with Special Reference to the House Committee on Rules. *Harvard.*

David D. Levine, Legislation by Executive Order in the Federal Government. *American.*

James R. Lewis, The Impact of Television on Political Conventions and Campaigns. *American.*

Richard P. Longaker, Andrew Jackson and the Presidency. *Cornell.*

John C. Lowe, New Deal Democracy: Its Impact on American Democratic Processes. *Iowa.*

Joseph D. Lubin, The Item Veto and the Presidency. *California* (Berkeley).

Thornton McClanahan, Organization of the Presidency for Fiscal Policy. *Harvard.*

Charles B. Macklin, Land Grant Colleges and Public Policy. *Chicago.*

William B. Macomber, Jr., The Congressional Republicans and Organized Labor; 1926–1948. *Chicago.*

Lewis Mainzer, Research Policy Formation under the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. *Chicago.*

Elizabeth Marvick, The Study of Voting Behavior in Its Relation to the Theory of Political Democracy. *Columbia.*

Norman Meller, Centralization and Integration in Hawaii. *Chicago.*

Frank S. Mellor, Employment of Civilians by the Department of the Army: Factors in Determining Whether Military or Civilian Personnel Should Be Assigned to Particular Activities or Jobs. *Harvard.*

Leno C. Michelon, Post-War Conceptions of Managerial Responsibility in Labor Relations. *Chicago.*

John H. Michener, The United States Cabinet: A Study of Proposed Modifications, with Special Reference to Cabinet-Congressional Relations. *California* (Berkeley).

Don Muchmore, Political Use of the Presidential Appointive Power, 1900–1950. *California* (Los Angeles).

A. Edward Patmos, Some Recent Attempts of Non-Political Organizations to Influence Federal Legislation. *New York University.*

Winfield Payne, Public Policy and Government Regulation of Transportation. *Harvard.*

Denis Philipps, Americans and Compulsory Military Service: A Study of Changing Public Policy with Particular Reference to the Period 1940–1951. *New York University.*

Ira Polley, Wage Stabilization in Region 8: A Case Study. *Minnesota.*

John R. Probert, The National Security Act of 1947. *Pennsylvania.*

Edward William Proxmire, The Limitations and Possibilities of Increasing Public Understanding of National Politics through the Daily Newspaper. *Harvard.*

Louis A. Radelet, The Presidency and the Crisis; Powers of the Office from Pearl Harbor to V-J Day. *Notre Dame.*

Harry H. Ransom, United States Congress and Air Power, 1919–1926. *Princeton.*

Norman F. Reber, Main Factors That Determine the Editorial Content of Farm Magazines as It Relates to Influence on Public Opinion. *Pennsylvania.*

Merton L. Reichler, Disintegration and Insurgency in the Democratic Party in New York County. *Columbia.*

Ross Richard Rice, The Politics of Missouri Valley Development. *Chicago.*

Donald H. Riddle, The Truman Committee: A Study in Congressional Control of the Military. *Princeton.*

James W. Riddlesperger, Alexander Hamilton and the Modern American Constitution. *Texas.*

Charles L. Robertson, The Role of the Secretary of State in Foreign Policy Making. *Princeton.*

George Robinson, The Development of the Senate Committee System. *New York University.*

John Henry Romani, The Philippine Presidency: An Evaluation in Terms of American Practice and Procedure. *Michigan.*

James N. Rosenau, The Senate and Dean Acheson, 1949–52. *Princeton.*

Harold I. Roth, Collective Bargaining Patterns in the Motion Picture Industry. *Chicago.*

Lloyd I. Rudolph, American Politics 1787–1800: A Study in the Origin of Party. *Harvard.*

Martha Lee Saenger, The 1944 Presidential Campaign: An Analysis of the Forces behind the Pro-Roosevelt CIO Political Action Committee. *Ohio State.*

Warren D. St. James, The NAACP: Its Organization and Methods. *St. Louis University.*

Carl Santoro, A New Approach to the Problem of Non-Voting. *Pennsylvania.*

O. Glenn Saxon, Jr., The Policies and Attitudes of the American Federation of Musicians on Technological Advance. *Columbia.*

Peter P. Schauffler, The History and Potentialities of the Legislative Veto Device in the Federal Government. *Harvard.*

Kenneth E. Scott, Marshall Plan and Executive Decision Making. *Princeton.*

Edgar L. Shor, The Political Role of the Secretary of Labor: The Secretary and Labor Policy Since 1933. *Chicago.*

Morris L. Simon, The 1948 Election: An Interpretive Study. *Cornell.*

Robert C. Spencer, The Steel Dispute of 1952: A Case Study in the Politics of Collective Bargaining. *Chicago.*

Robert C. Stender, The Defense Budgetary Process. *Harvard.*

Oscar Stradinger, The Bureau of Reclamation: A Study in Administrative Organization and Techniques as These Influence and Are Influenced by Policy Positions. *Chicago.*

Ross B. Talbot, The Politics of Agricultural Organization: 1925–1948. *Chicago.*

Harris E. Thurber, The Vermont Judiciary: A Study in Cultural Adaptation. *Princeton.*

Edwin Timbers, Labor Unions and Fair Employment Practices Legislation. *Michigan.*

Henry Tomasek, The Great Plains Agricultural Council. *Chicago.*

Daniel Webster Tuttle, Intergovernmental Relations in Wyoming Land Policy and Administration. *Minnesota.*

Robert W. Van de Velde, The Role of U.S. Propaganda in Italy's Return to Political Democracy. *Princeton.*

Edwin R. Walker, Changing Tools and Techniques of American Statecraft. *Princeton.*

Andrew J. Wann, Franklin D. Roosevelt: A Study of Leadership. *Missouri.*

Leo Weinstein, The Place of Lobbying in the Legislative Process. *Chicago.*

CONSTITUTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW IN THE UNITED STATES

Roscoe C. Adkins, Justice Brandeis and Administrative Law. *Texas.*

Redmond J. Allman, Variation in the Number of Associate Justices on the Supreme Court of the United States from 1801 to 1869. *Notre Dame.*

Barton Bean, The American Civil Liberties Union; History and Analysis. *Cornell.*

Alfons J. Beitzinger, Chief Justice Ryan of the Wisconsin Supreme Court. *Wisconsin.*

Walter F. Berns, Judicial Interpretations of Freedom and the Problem of Virtue. *Chicago.*

William E. Biggs, The Defense Production Act: A Study in Administrative Law. *Ohio State.*

George R. Blackburn, Freedom of Association: The Group versus the Individual before the Courts. *Harvard.*

Virgil C. Blum, Legal Aspects of Equality and Religious Liberty in the United States since 1900. *St. Louis.*

Gordon B. Cleveland, The Role of the Rule of Law in the Administrative State, with Special Emphasis on Civil Liberties. *North Carolina.*

Fredryc R. Darby, The Constitutionality of Anti-Miscegenation Laws under the 14th Amendment. *California* (Berkeley).

Emily Dawson, The Supreme Court's Conception of Religious Liberty in the Jehovah's Witnesses' Cases. *Minnesota.*

Christopher Dyer-Bennet, The Vitality of the Judicial Opinions of Justice John Marshall Harlan. *California.* (Berkeley).

Stephen T. Early, Jr., Mr. Justice McReynolds and the Judicial Process. *Virginia.*

William P. Ehling, Contempt by Publication: Historical Development in Theory and Practice. *Syracuse.*

Charles W. Engelland, William O. Douglas, Dissenting Justice. *Iowa.*

Dorothy Fields, Mr. Justice Murphy. *Columbia.*

William F. Fitzgerald, A Study of the Effects of the *Shelley* v. *Kraemer* Decision with Respect to Restrictive Covenants. *Georgetown.*

Howard I. Forman. Government Ownership of Patents and Patent Rights. *Pennsylvania.*

Royal C. Gilkey, Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Civil Liberties. *Minnesota.*

Walter Gouch, Judicial Philosophy and Opinions of Justice Cardozo. *Johns Hopkins.*

Milton Greenberg, The Loyalty Oath in the American Experience. *Wisconsin.*

Luther Hagard, The Equality of the States in the United States: Theory, Constitutional Law and Practice. *Minnesota.*

Timothy G. Higgins, The Politics of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin in the Progressive Era, 1900–1917. *Wisconsin.*

Charles A. Hollister, Judicial Interpretation of the Declaration of Rights in the Pennsylvania Constitution. *Pennsylvania.*

John W. Hopkirk, William O. Douglas, Individualist. *Princeton.*

John T. Kitos, Coordination of Public Health and Hospital Administration in New York State. *Syracuse.*

Jacob Kossman, Constitutional Rights of a

Defendant in Federal Criminal Proceedings. *Pennsylvania.*

Oscar Kraines, Ernst Freund's Contribution to American Legal Thought. *New York University.*

Roseana Kronick, The Power of the President to Remove Officials, with Emphasis upon Officials Exercising Quasi-Judicial and Quasi-Legislative Functions. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert S. Lancaster, The Political Philosophy and Jurisprudence of Judge Learned Hand. *Michigan.*

J. T. Law, The Constitutional Ideas of Mr. Justice Horace Gray. *Wisconsin.*

Ruth Leffler, The Concept of Governmental Tort Liability Culminating in the Federal Tort Claims Act: A Political and Legal Analysis. *Chicago.*

Harold J. Leu, Some Constitutional Aspects of the Extra-Continental Jurisdiction of the United States. *Michigan.*

Eleanor Tabor Linenthal, Free Speech and the Power of the Courts and Congress to Punish for Contempt. *Cornell.*

Theodore V. Liss, The Genesis and Development of the Concept of the Free Flow of Commerce. *Michigan.*

Lewis I. Maddocks, The Dissenting Opinions of Justice Harlan. *Ohio State.*

John M. Martin, Jr., Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the United States. *Johns Hopkins.*

Eugene A. Mawhinney, The Development of the Concept of Liberty in the Fourteenth Amendment. *Illinois.*

Ernest E. Means, Free Speech v. Fair Trial. *Wisconsin.*

Robert T. Miller, Judicial Interpretation of Religious Freedom in the U.S. *Texas.*

Lyndon R. Musolf, Some Aspects of Federal-State Water Problems and the Courts. *California* (Los Angeles).

Harding C. Noblitt, The Supreme Court and the Progressive Era, 1902–1921. *Chicago.*

Gilbert L. Oddo, Mr. Justice Douglas and the Supreme Court. *Georgetown.*

Julius Paul, The Legal Philosophy of Jerome Frank: A Study of the Law in Action. *Ohio State.*

Palmer C. Pilcher, Liability of Hospitals and Hospital Administrators. *Syracuse.*

Earl Adrian Radley, Mr. Justice Frankfurter's Conception of the Role of the Supreme Court in the American Federal System. *Harvard.*

Charles M. Rehmus, Executive Powers in National Emergency Labor Disputes. *Stanford.*

Nelson M. Robinson, Regulatory Systems and Hospital Standards. *Syracuse.*

Yosal Rogat, Mr. Justice Frankfurter and the Doctrine of Judicial Restraint. *California* (Berkeley).

Eva R. Rubin, The Supreme Court at Mid-Century: A Study of Judicial Self-Limitation. *Johns Hopkins.*

Robert Runo, Law Making by the Roosevelt Court: A Study in Methods of Statutory Interpretation. *Chicago.*

Robert H. Salisbury, Jr., The United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit: A Study in Policy Formation. *Illinois.*

John R. Schmidhauser, The Role of the Supreme Court as Arbiter in Federal-State Relations. *Virginia.*

Alan Silverman, Mr. Justice Douglas and Civil Liberties. *Columbia.*

L. Dean Sprague, Civil Rights during War. *Syracuse.*

Robert J. Steamer, The Constitutional Doctrines of Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson. *Cornell.*

K. T. W. Swanson, The Rise of Public Prosecution in the American System. *Syracuse.*

John H. Vanderzell, Administrative Patterns Established by State Legislation to Regulate Residential Building and Housing. *Syracuse.*

William Welsh, The Local Regulation of Minimum Housing Standards in Selected Cities throughout the United States. *Syracuse.*

Warren C. White, The Constitutional Privilege against Self-Incrimination. *Maryland.*

AMERICAN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Frank C. Abbott, State Organization and Administration of Tax-Supported Higher Education. *Harvard.*

Sylvester S. Aichele, Pressure Groups and the Legislative Process in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

Dee Akers, Procedures of Regulatory Administration in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. *Kentucky.*

Eva Aronfreed, City of Philadelphia Public Relations Department. *Pennsylvania.*

Chester W. Bain, The Readjustment of City and County Boundaries in Virginia. *Virginia.*

Richard N. Baisden, Los Angeles Labor and the Los Angeles City Government. *Chicago.*

Sidney Belanoff, Geographical Variations in Political Participation in the Detroit Area. *Michigan.*

Jewel Bellush, Herbert H. Lehman, Lt. Governor and Governor: A Study in State Leadership, 1928–1942. *Columbia.*

Wallace H. Best, Referendum Politics in California. *Southern California.*

Joe H. Bindley, Voting Behavior in Ohio, 1924–1950, An Analytical Study. *California* (Los Angeles)

Lemuel F. Blitz, The Involvement of Local Governments in Metropolitan Problems in the Norfolk, Virginia, Area. *North Carolina.*

William J. Block, The Separation of the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service: A Study of Group Activities. *Illinois.*

John A. Bond, Legislative Reapportionment in Minnesota. *Minnesota.*

Gary P. Brazier, Intergovernmental Relations in the Field of Public Airports, with Special Reference to Minnesota. *Minnesota.*

Morton Broffman, Executive Office of the Mayor of New York City. *Harvard.*

Oliver C. Carmichael, Jr., New York Establishes a State University. *Columbia.*

Wen-Pin Chen, State Supervision and Control over Local Law Enforcement in the United States. *Illinois.*

Robert L. Clark, State Administrative Supervision over Local Government, West Virginia. *Illinois.*

Charles C. Curran, The Health Function on the Local Level: Kansas City, Missouri—An Administrative Case Study. *Harvard.*

Thomas J. Davy, State Administered In-Service Training Programs for Municipal Officials under the George-Deen Act, with Special Reference to Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

Carl E. DeVane, Problems Allocating the Principles of Administration in the Process of Public Budgeting, with Special Reference to the City of Philadelphia. *Pennsylvania.*

Stanley E. Dewey, Impact of a Federal Project (Pike County Atomic Energy Plant) on Local Government in Rural Ohio, with Special Reference to Intergovernmental Relations. *Ohio State.*

Gerald E. Dunn, State Courts and the Administration of Federal Law. *Johns Hopkins.*

George Elcaness, A History of the Consolidation of the City of New York. *New York University.*

Floyd O. Flom, The Legislative Process in Minnesota, with Emphasis on the Role of the Individual Legislator. *Minnesota.*

William R. Gable, Politics and Personalities on the Chicago City Council. *Chicago.*

Fenton Gage, Local Housing Authorities of Upstate New York. *Harvard.*

Herbert Garfinkel, F. E. P. C. Legislation in Illinois. *Chicago.*

Louise B. Gerrard, Newspapers and Politics: Proportional Representation in New York City. *Columbia.*

Frank K. Gibson, The Control of Stream Pollution in West Virginia. *North Carolina.*

John Gillespie, Governments in Travis County, Texas. *Texas.*

Gibson Gray, A Political Education for the New Reformers: A Study of the Evolution of the Movement for Fair Employment Legislation in Pennsylvania from 1945 to 1951. *Columbia.*

Stewart L. Grow, The Development of National Parties in Utah. *Utah.*

G. Phillips Hanna, New Hampshire Politics: A Case Study of the Recruitment of Political Leaders. *Princeton.*

Leroy C. Hardy, Reapportionment in California, 1951: A Political Analysis. *California* (Los Angeles).

Louise Harned, Participation in Political Parties: A Study of Party Committeemen. *Yale.*

Frederick H. Harris, Jr., A Study of Political Activity in Two North Carolina Counties. *North Carolina.*

Donald B. Hayman, Social Security and State and Local Retirement in North Carolina. *North Carolina.*

Allan Healey, An Analytical History of the Power of Political Parties in Illinois, 1928–1948. *Chicago.*

Clarence J. Hein, The Operation of the Direct Primary in Minnesota. *Minnesota.*

Page L. Ingraham, Politics of Agriculture in Minnesota, 1930–1950. *Chicago.*

Evan A. Iverson, The Two Party System in Utah. *Utah.*

James A. Jarvis, Intergovernmental Relationships of Louisville, Kentucky, with Special Reference to Public Housing. *Illinois.*

Eugene W. Jones, The Employment Security Commission in North Carolina. *North Carolina.*

David Lazar, The Suffrage in New York State. *New York University.*

Charles F. LeeDecker, State Grants-in-Aid to Local Governments in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania State.*

Virginia E. Lewis, Fifty Years of Politics in Memphis. *New York University.*

Ellis E. McCune, Jury Selection in California: A Study in Judicial Administration. *California* (Los Angeles).

Russell W. Maddox, Jr., Extraterritorial Powers of Municipalities in the United States. *Illinois.*

Seymour Mendelsohn, The Administrative Organization of Field Services in New York. *New York University.*

Lois B. Merk, Massachusetts in the Woman Suffrage Movement. *Harvard.*

Warner Mills, Jr., Ross Sterling, Governor of Texas. *Johns Hopkins.*

Lee Moore, Annexation and the Administration of Metropolitan Areas in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania State.*

John C. Murray, The Development of the Executive Branch of Government in Rhode Island. *Brown.*

Isham G. Newton, A Survey of the Minor Judiciary of North Carolina, with Special Emphasis on the Justice of the Peace. *Pennsylvania.*

Walter H. Niehoff, Democratic Trends in the Constitutions of Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania State.*

James Nietmann, The Administration of Government in the City of St. Louis, Missouri, 1875–1950. *Harvard.*

Garfield S. Pancoast, The Second Class Township in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

Daisy Parker, The Executive Department of the State of Florida. *Virginia.*

Philip C. Pendleton, A Critical Analysis of the Effectiveness of the Municipal Leagues of Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

Clara Penniman, Recent Developments in the Administration of the State Income Tax. *Minnesota.*

Frank Peters, The Colonial Governor of Delaware. *Duke.*

Theodore P. Pidus, The Council Manager Plan in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

Nathaniel S. Preston, Scope and Control in the Use of the Public Corporation by American State and Local Government. *Princeton.*

Harold L. Rakov, The Changing Focus of Administration and Control of Public and Private Education in New York State *Syracuse.*

Martin R. Ream, Alcohol Beverage Revenues and Control: A Comparative Study of the Financial and Social Aspects of the State Monopoly and the State Liquor Licensing System, with Special Emphasis on their Application to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New York. *Pennsylvania.*

Joseph W. Reid, Jr., Intergovernmental Relations in Alabama. *North Carolina.*

Samuel J. Resnick, The City Planning Commission and the Department of City Planning of the City of New York. *New York University.*

Robert B. Richert, Participation of Citizens in Advisory Committees and Administrative Boards: Selected Michigan Cities, 1945–1952. *Michigan.*

Joseph Robertson, The Regulation of Public Utilities in Alabama. *Minnesota.*

Lawrence W. Robertson, The Power Structure of UAW-CIO and Its Impact on Public Policy in Michigan. *Northwestern.*

Bernard Rubin, Public Relations as a Function of Modern Government: A Study of Its Development in the Executive Department of New York State. *New York University.*

Robert L. Sawyer, Jr., The Regulation and Control of Subversive Activities in Michigan. *Michigan.*

Walter F. Scheffer, Truck Transportation, A Major Factor in the Highway Problem of Wisconsin. *Wisconsin.*

Joseph A. Schlesinger, Methods of Ascendancy to the Office of Governor in the United States. *Yale.*

Gerard H. Silverburgh, Fusion Reform in New York City, 1933–1934. *Columbia.*

Francis J. Sorauf, Jr., The Growth of Voluntary Committees in Wisconsin Political Parties. *Wisconsin.*

James K. Sours, Local Rent Control in Wichita (Intergovernmental Relations). *Harvard.*

Israel Stiefel, Reorganization of the Pennsylvania State Administrative Structure. *Pennsylvania.*

John O. Stitely, The Rhode Island General Assembly. *Harvard.*

John E. Swanson, The Use of the Licensing Power by the City of St. Louis. *Illinois.*

Marvin Tableman, City-State Fiscal Relations in Michigan, 1937–1947. *Michigan.*

James D. Thomas, Jr., County Government and Administration in Alabama. *Ohio State.*

A. E. Van Eaton, The Initiative and Referendum in Missouri. *Missouri.*

J. Roffe Wike, II, The Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association: A Study of a Political Interest Group. *Pennsylvania.*

William C. Wimberly, The Illinois Primary. *Illinois.*

Arthur B. Winter, Special Governmental Districts in Tennessee. *Duke.*

Frederick M. Wirt, State Motion Picture Censorship: A Study in Freedom and Power. *Ohio State.*

Lloyd Woodruff, County Boards in Wisconsin. *Minnesota.*

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Sidney Baldwin, The Farm Security Administration: A Study in Politics and Administration. *Syracuse.*

William J. Bell, A Reexamination of Bureaucracy. *Indiana.*

Eugenie K. Bigelow, Role of Advisory Bodies in the Foreign Service. *Pennsylvania.*

William R. Bigger, Flood Control in Los Angeles County: A Study in Inter-Government Relations. *California* (Los Angeles).

Calvin G. Brooks, Administration of an Extended Social Security System in the United States. *American.*

Milon L. Brown, Personnel Policies and Practices in Federal Administration: A Critique of Personnel Management in Selected Federal Agencies. *Pennsylvania.*

Andrew S. Bullis, Jr., Fiscal Administration in Selected Pennsylvania Cities. *Syracuse.*

Frederick O. Bundy, The Administration of Rule Making and Licensing Processes under Selected Statutes of the Department of Agriculture. *Syracuse.*

Charles E. Campbell, Current Executive Development Programs in the United States Army and Air Force with an Appraisal of Selected American Industrial Training Procedures. *American.*

John M. Capozzola, The New York Regional Office of the N.L.R.B.; Organization, Policies and Procedures. *Pennsylvania State.*

Daniel T. Carroll, The Development of the Appeals System in the Federal Civil Service. *Chicago.*

Vernon W. Darter, Two Different Approaches to Extension Program Development and their Influence on Program Content. *Harvard.*

Laurel A. Engberg, The Administration of Non-Tax-Supported Liberal Arts Colleges in the Middle West. *Wisconsin.*

Harold E. Finnegan, Quantitative Measures of Manpower Management and an Interpretation of Their Application in a Large Federal Mental Hospital. *American.*

Emanuel Fuchs, Federal-State Relations in River Basin Development: A Case Study of the Missouri Valley. *Harvard.*

David R. Gardner, The Coordination of Federal, Regional, State, and Local Agencies in the Preparation of Detailed Soil Survey Reports. *Harvard.*

George Goodwin, Group Formulation of Railroad Policy. *Harvard.*

Clifford R. Gross, The Budgetary Administration of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. *Syracuse.*

John F. Haltom, National Security and Individual Liberty, 1939–1953. *Texas.*

Marvin Harder, A Study of the Administration of Federal Grants-in-Aid in the State of Kansas. *Columbia.*

Edward L. Henry, A Politico-Administrative Appraisal of Government Organization for Monetary Policy. *Chicago.*

Robert S. Herman, Revenue Estimating in New York State Government. *New York University.*

Lawrence J. Herson, State Administrative Reorganization: The Precedent of Illinois. *Yale.*

Duane W. Hill, State-Municipal Relations in Iowa. *Iowa.*

Victor C. Hobday, Tennessee Municipalities and TVA Electric Power. *Syracuse.*

Barrett Hollister, Natural Resources Administration in Ohio. *Syracuse.*

Erin Hubbert, William Ashby Jump, Public Administrator. *Syracuse.*

Clyde W. Humphrey, Organizing and Administering Vocational Business Training in Public Educational Agencies. *American.*

Benjamin L. Hunton, The Budget of the Department of War, 1922–1932. *American.*

Albert P. Ingraham, Situational Factors in Federal Government Executive Positions and Their Relation to Executive Selection and Development. *American.*

Penrose Jackson, Personnel of Selected Federal Regulatory Commissions. *Texas.*

Judith N. Jamison, Administrative Reforms of the Hiram Johnson Era in California. *California* (Los Angeles).

David L. Jickling, The Personnel System of the U. S. Post Office. *Chicago.*

Milton G. Johnson, The Development of Public Medical Care for Children in Oklahoma through Services to the Crippled: A Case Study of Administrative Federalism. *Harvard.*

Garth N. Jones, Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. *Utah.*

Francis X. Kane, Empirical Method of Determining Material Shortages in the Event of Total Mobilization. *Georgetown.*

Leon J. Katz, The Public Relations Concept in Public Administration; the Theory and Practice of Public Relations in Democratic Public Administration, with Special Reference to the Federal Security Agency. *Columbia.*

Robert V. Kirch, Regulatory Administration in a Public Utility: A Case Study. *Indiana.*

Robert L. Kline, The Administration of Federal Migratory Waterfowl Legislation. *Iowa.*

David C. Knapp, The Appropriations Committees and Agricultural Adjustment Administration (1940–1950): A Study in Legislative-Administrative Relations. *Chicago.*

Anna Knoll, The Problem of Training Career Administrators. *American.*

Donald W. Krimel, Government Public Relations as an Administrative Tool. *Wisconsin.*

Gerhard J. Kruger, Position Classification and Employment Politics in the Department of Agriculture from 1914 to the Present Time. *American.*

Ezra Lander, Performance Budgeting and Accounting Policy in the Department of the Army. *American.*

William Larsen, The Field Service of the United States Bureau of the Budget. *California* (Berkeley).

John A. Larson, Jr., State-Local Fiscal Relationships in Arkansas. *Northwestern.*

George R. Long, The Administration of Virginia State Highways. *Virginia.*

William H. Ludlow, Government Control of Urban Population Densities. *Chicago.*

Conrad L. McBride, Role of the States in Conservation and Development of Natural Resources. *California* (Los Angeles).

John P. McCarthy, Legislative-Executive Relations: Federal Organization. *Chicago.*

Donal E. J. MacNamara, The Administrative Organization and Operation of Provost Marshal General Activities in World War II. *Columbia.*

Byron S. Martin, Planning for Total Mobilization for War in the United States: 1920–1940. *Chicago.*

Charles Miller, II, The Administrative Feasibility of Including Domestic Servants under the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Program. *Pennsylvania.*

Winfred P. Minter, Military Purchasing and Procurement by the Confederate War Department, 1861–65. *Chicago.*

Arthur J. Misner, Faculty Participation in University Administration. *California.* (Berkeley).

William B. Monat, A Critical and Evaluative Study of the Minnesota State Merit System. *Minnesota.*

Martin W. Moser, The Personnel System in the Department of State. *Maryland.*

Maurice J. Mountain, Domestic Operations of the Office of War Information. *Harvard.*

Mildred E. Negus, A Study of the Unit Cost of a Tax-Supported Public Health Nursing Service, with Special Reference to the District of Columbia. *American.*

James E. Nix, The Admission of Negroes to State Universities in the South. *Syracuse.*

William C. Nolan, Organization for the Regulation of Trade—The Federal Trade Commission from Humphrey to the Basing Point Decisions. *New York University.*

Benjamin L. Olsen, Administrative Aspects of Water Resource Development in California. *Stanford.*

W. Scott Payne, Public Policy in the Field of Air Transportation. *Harvard.*

Robert H. Pealy, State Administration of the Property Tax: A Comparative Study of Five States. *Michigan.*

Ben Posner, Accounting Data as Related to Performance Budgeting in the Federal Government. *American.*

Robert W. Powers, Interagency Cooperation in Foreign Technical Assistance Programs. *Minnesota.*

Lee B. Reifel, Limitations and Potentialities of Democratic Administration in Colleges and Universities in the United States. *American.*

Vorley Rexroad, The Administration of the Los Alamos Atomic Energy Project. *New York University.*

Harry W. Reynolds, Jr., Executive Coordination of Administrative Boards and Commissions in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania.*

Leo Richards, Budgeting in the National Housing Agency. *American.*

Herbert Rosenberg, Program Planning of Scientific Research and Development in the Navy Department. *Chicago.*

Arthur H. Rosien, The Administrative Relationship between the Army and the Territory of Alaska. *Syracuse.*

Harold H. Roth, The Executive Office of the President: Its Development as an Administrative Instrument. *American.*

Lloyd W. Schram, The Columbia River Basin and the Columbia Basin Joint Investigations with Special Reference to Problem 12. *Washington* (Seattle).

Bernard E. Schultz, The Federal Occupational Classification Structure under the Classification Act of 1949. *American.*

William J. Siffin, Government and the Cotton Problem. *Harvard.*

James E. Skillington, Jr., Proposed Modifications of Congressional Participation in the Budgetary Process. *American.*

David W. Smith, The Board of Examiners in Montana State Administration. *Utah.*

Elizabeth B. Smith, Intergovernmental Relations in Public Health Administration: A Study of the Adaptation and Execution of Public Policy. *Virginia.*

Sidney Spector, Public Administration among Primitive Societies. *Chicago.*

Richard Stuart, Financing Capital Improvements in Maine. *Pennsylvania.*

Nelson E. Taylor, Jr., The Association of American Railroads—Its Role as a Pressure Group. *Harvard.*

David M. Thorpe, Program Development and Coordination of Agricultural Agencies. *Harvard.*

Maurice K. Townsend, The Personnel Function: A Study in Staff-Line Relations. *Chicago.*

Simon Tucker, The Development of the Employment Activities of the United States Civil Service Commission. *American.*

A. Donald Urquhart, The Conduct of Administrative Hearings in Metropolitan Los Angeles. *California* (Los Angeles).

Alice W. Wallace, Public Welfare Administration at the City-County Level in Michigan. *Michigan.*

Marshall O. Watkins, The Role of the Extension Specialist and his Relation to the Extension Program. *Harvard.*

Troy Westmeyer, Administration of Municipal Income and Payroll Taxes. *New York University.*

J. Lee Westrate, The Administrative Theories and Practices of Herbert Hoover. *Chicago.*

William L. C. Wheaton, The Administration of the Federal Housing Program. *Chicago.*

Donald Wilhelm, Jr., Some Aspects of the Public Administration of Natural Science Research. *Harvard.*

George L. Willis, Administrative Development of Alcoholic Beverage Control in Indiana. *Indiana.*

Walter Wilmot, Administration of Air Pollution Control. *Harvard.*

Jesse D. Winzenreid, The State of Wyoming: A History and Evaluation of Financial Administration. *New York University.*

John L. Withers, The Administrative Theory and Practice of William Howard Taft. *Chicago.*

Arthur Wolfe, American Civil Service Examinations. *Chicago.*

James R. Woodworth, Administration of the Pure Food, Drugs and Cosmetics Act since 1938. *Harvard.*

Laurence N. Woodworth, United States Taxation of Income Earned Abroad. *New York University.*

John D. Young, Regional Administration in the Federal Security Agency. *American.*

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Mohammed Adham, Special Problems of Government in the Arab States of the Middle East. *American.*

Bruce Adkinson, British Commonwealth in Southeast Asia. *Princeton.*

Berndt G. Angman, The Ideological Development of the Social Democratic Party of Sweden in Regard to the Question of Socialization, 1932–1952. *Texas.*

David E. Apter, Political Democracy in Africa: A Study of Institutional Transfer in the Gold Coast. *Princeton.*

Robert W. Barrie, The Council of Europe. *Minnesota.*

Paul Barringer, Soviet Policy toward Scientific Research: A Case Study. *Harvard.*

Richard Barron, The Political Parties and the Fourth French Republic. *Virginia.*

Harry J. Benda, Some Political Aspects of the Japanese Occupation of Indonesia. *Cornell.*

Richard Bender, Structure and Organization of the Associated States of Vietnam. *Cornell.*

Fredrick T. Bent, The Policies and Practices of British Municipal Labor Unions. *Chicago.*

William Berry, Problems in the Economic Development of British African Territories. *Harvard.*

John A. Billings, The British Administration of the Mandate of Transjordan, 1923–1939. *Princeton.*

Byron E. Blankinship, Spain and World War I: A Study of Foreign Policy, 1910–1920. *Columbia.*

Louis C. Boochever, Jr., The Development of the Soviet Coal Industry. *Harvard.*

Frank R. Brandenburg, The Philosophy of the

Mexican Revolutionary Party. *Pennsylvania.*

Conrad Brant, The Chinese Communist Party and the Comintern, 1924–1930. *Harvard.*

Cecil C. Brett, Local Autonomy in Okayama Prefecture, Japan: A Study of National-Local Relations. *Michigan.*

Lyle C. Brown, The Cardinas Administration in Mexico, 1934–40. *Texas.*

Leslie Bundgaard, Local Government in the Philippines. *Georgetown.*

Ben G. Burnett, The Colombian Party System: A Contemporary Analysis. *California* (Los Angeles).

Leo D. Cagan, Civil Service Unions: A Comparative Study of American and British Commonwealth Experience. *Chicago.*

Charles Carroll, Australia and Argentina—A Study of the Bases of Federal Government. *Harvard.*

Tse-Tsung Chow, The May Fourth Movement and Its Influence upon China's Political and Social Development. *Michigan.*

James B. Christoph, Theories, Laws and Practices Concerning the Political and Civil Rights of State Workers in Great Britain. *Minnesota.*

Cathie L. Clark, The Development of Government and Administration in Brazil since 1889. *American.*

Alessandro L. Corradini, The Conduct of Foreign Affairs in Great Britain. *Wisconsin.*

Robert Curtis, Origins and Development of the Mouvement Republicain Populaire. *Georgetown.*

Jose M. de Gamboa, Philippine Political Parties as Instruments of Reform. *Cornell.*

William F. DeMyer, The Political Career of Leon Blum. *Georgetown.*

Kurt DeWitt, The Relation between Civil and Military Power in a Totalitarian Dictatorship: The Wehrmacht and the Nazi Party 1933–1945. *George Washington.*

Alfred Diamant, The Course of Political Catholicism in Austria. *Yale.*

Roger Di-Gioja, The Problem of the Executive in France, and the Fear of Bonapartism. *Notre Dame.*

Jack D. Dowell, German Rearmament. *Stanford.*

Eugene Dvorin, The New Federation of Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. *California* (Los Angeles).

John Eaves, Jr., Emergency Powers and the Parliamentary Watchdog. *Columbia.*

J. Dixon Edwards, Japan's Relations with the Prewar Puppet Governments of China: A Study in Nationalist Foreign Operations. *Columbia.*

Marie A. Edwards, Labor Legislation in Occupied Japan, 1945–1950. *Northwestern.*

Irma E. Eichhorn, German Foreign Policy after Munich. *Michigan.*

Harold T. Ellis, The Political and Economic Effects of Partition in Ireland, 1920–1950. *Stanford.*

Frederick C. Engelmann, The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation of Canada. *Yale.*

John G. Eriksen, Church and State Relations in Germany, 1930–1945. *Minnesota.*

Donald R. Farmer, Federalism and Multinationalism in the Soviet Union. *Minnesota.*

Josephine Fishel, The Fabian Society and the British Labour Party. *Duke.*

Cary O. Fisher, Revolution by Coup d'Etat: A Study of Modern Revolutionary Strategy and Tactics. *Stanford.*

William S. Flash, Democratic Aspects of the British National Health Service: Local Government and Regionalized Health. *Harvard.*

William Fleming, The Jurisdiction of German Courts to Decide Controversies Arising under the Weimar Constitution. *Columbia.*

Harold A. Fletcher, Jr., The Nationalization of Industry in France: A Study of the Political and Administrative Aspects of the Problem. *Harvard.*

Charles R. Foster, A Study of the German Social Democratic Party. *Ohio State.*

I. Paul Giardina, The Economic Effects of the Disposition of the Italian Colonies upon the Economy of Italy. *New York University.*

George Garofalides, The Greek Enigma. *New York University.*

John L. Groom, The Function of Soviet Law. *Southern California.*

William B. Gwyn, Democracy and Political Expenses in Nineteenth Century England. *Virginia.*

Susan Han, The Chinese Elite. *Chicago.*

William S. Hardenbergh, The Legislative Assembly of British Columbia. *Illinois.*

Louis K. Harris, Democracy in Latin America. *California* (Los Angeles).

Dan F. Henderson, The Pattern and Persistence of Traditional Procedures in Japanese Law. *California* (Berkeley).

Laurin L. Henry, International Technical Assistance in Public Administration. *Chicago.*

Paul H. Heppe, The Ideology of the Canadian Liberal Party 1921–1951. *Wisconsin.*

James K. Herold, The Role of the Trade Unions in Nationalized Industries—A Case Study: The National Union of Mineworkers. *Harvard.*

H. Grant Hicks, Chinese Nationalist Administration and Reform in Formosa. *Columbia.*

Karl A. Hochschwender, The Politics of Civil Service Reform in Western Germany. *Yale.*

Ernest V. Hollis, Jr., The Soviet Police System, 1917–1946. *Columbia.*

Ursula Holtermann, Democracy Resurrected: A Study of German Political Parties, 1945–1950. *Chicago.*

Leonard J. Horwitz, United States-Argentine Relations 1943–1947, with Special Reference to the Braden-Peron Affair. *Pennsylvania.*

George M. Hougham, Minor Parties in Canadian National Politics. *Pennsylvania.*

W. Carter Ide, The Politics of French Labor. *Harvard.*

Eric G. James, Administrative Planning in the British Caribbean, with Special Reference to Jamaica. *New York University.*

T. M. Joshi, Economics of Public Finance in Bombay. *Pennsylvania.*

Misha N. Kadick, Soviet Use of Manpower. *Princeton.*

Eli Kaminsky, The French Government and the Communists since 1947. *Harvard.*

Hosseim Kazemzadeh, The Impact of the United Nations Membership upon Iran's Power Position: A Study in Iran's Security Problems and the Impact of the U.N. *Princeton.*

James Kitchen, Local Government in Guatemala. *California* (Los Angeles).

Edward B. Kovar, France above the Parties: Gaullism and the Movement for Constitutional Revision in the Fourth Republic. *Columbia.*

Richard Kramer, Communist Moral Education of Children as Illustrated in Three Official Soviet Periodicals. *Columbia.*

William B. Kyes, A Comparison of the Air Defense Systems of Germany and the United Kingdom during World War II. *Georgetown.*

Frank C. Langdon, The Japanese Policy of Expansion in China, 1917–1928. *California* (Berkeley).

Joseph G. LaPalombara, The Postwar Democratic Labor Movement in Italy. *Princeton.*

Harry Lazer, Balfourian Conservatism: A Study in Political Ideas and Political Leadership. *Columbia.*

Jerzy Lerski, Polish Exiles in the United States, 1834–1865. *Georgetown.*

Frank M. Lewis, The Multi-Party System in the Presidential Form of Government in Chile. *Texas.*

J. Gus Liebenow, Jr., Comparative Studies of Indirect Rule in British East Africa. *Northwestern.*

Gerhard Loewenberg, Effects of Governing upon the British Labour Party, 1945–1951. *Cornell.*

Leo B. Lott, The Theory and Practice of Federalism in Venezuela. *Wisconsin.*

Ruth H. Lutz, The Political Parties of Mexico. *Pittsburgh.*

James H. McCrocklin, A Study of the Garde d'Haiti. *Texas.*

Thomas H. McLeod, Dominion-Provincial Conferences as a Technique in Intergovernmental Coordination. *Harvard.*

Sidney Mailick, The Emergence of a System of Administration in Israel. *Chicago.*

Joseph F. Marsh, British Departmental Decentralization: A Study of National Departmental Organization in the Southern (#6) Standard Region for the Administration of Public Health and Welfare Services. *Harvard.*

Albert A. Mavrinac, The Antecedents of the M.R.P. *Harvard.*

Douglas H. Mendel, Jr., A Study of Political Participation in Rural Japan. *Michigan.*

Frank A. Mesplé, The Native Political Parties of French North Africa. *Stanford.*

Frank O. Miller, Minobe Tatsukichi—Exponent of Liberal Constitutionalism under the Meiji Constitution. *California* (Berkeley).

Kenneth Miller, British Socialism and the Continuity of Foreign Policy, 1931–1950. *Johns Hopkins.*

Ante Mlikotin, The Structure of Contemporary Yugoslav Government. *Indiana.*

George R. Monsen, De Gaulle and the R.P.F.: Man, Movement and Mystique. *Stanford.*

Steven Muller, The Prime Ministership in Canada. *Cornell.*

Joe W. Neal, The State Governments of Northeastern Mexico: Coahuila, Nuevo Leon and Tamaulipas. *Texas.*

Mark Neuweld, The Central Organization of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; the Structure, Leadership and Dynamics of Development. *Harvard.*

Edward J. O'Connor, India and Democracy: An Analysis of the 1951–1952 Elections and Their Political Impact. *Notre Dame*

Eze A. Ogueri, The Indirect Rule System; Its Theory and Practice, and the Idea of Self-

Government (Independence) in the British Colonial and Protectorate Policy in Nigeria, 1890–1950. *Harvard.*

Leon V. Padgett, Popular Participation in the Mexican One-Party System. *Northwestern.*

Stelios Papadakis, An Introduction to the Constitutional History of Modern Greece. *Pennsylvania.*

H. Carroll Parish, Development of Democratic Institutions in Southeast Asia. *California* (Los Angeles).

Don Peretz, Israel and the Arab Refugees. *Columbia.*

Lawrence L. Petersen, The Swedish Cooperatives and Politics. *Notre Dame.*

Ivan M. Ponedel, The Development of English Labor Law: The Legal Position of the Laborer from 1349 to the Present. *California.* (Berkeley).

Jesse Proctor, Federation of the British West Indies. *Harvard.*

Robert Quick, Partisan Politics and Foreign Policy in Postwar France. *California* (Los Angeles).

Emanuel Rackman, Making of the Israeli Constitution. *Columbia.*

Russell F. Rhyne, The Political Impact of Economic Planning in Indonesia. *California* (Berkeley).

James Riedel, The British Debate on Foreign Policy: 1945–1950. *Chicago.*

Linford Dale Riley, Jr., The Associated States System in Indo-China. *California.* (Los Angeles).

James S. Roberts, The Participation of Civil Servants in Partisan Political Activities in Sweden. *North Carolina.*

Owen W. Roberts, The Colonial Policy of the French Socialist Party, 1946–1951. *Columbia.*

Leslie G. Rofe, The French Economic Council. *Columbia.*

William L. Rofes, A Study of the Prime Minister in Great Britain. *Columbia.*

Leo E. Rose, The Effect of Occupation Policy upon the Labor Movement in Japan. *California* (Berkeley).

Alvin Z. Rubinstein, An Analysis of Soviet Economic Policy in the Economic and Social Council and the Economic Commission for Europe, 1946–1951. *Pennsylvania.*

Robert Rupen, The Course of Nationalism in Outer Mongolia, 1900–1925. *Washington.* (Seattle).

Thomas A. Rusch, The Role of Socialist Ideology in the Congress Party of India, 1931–1951. *Chicago.*

Hassan H. Saab, The Impact of Communism on Islamic Society. *Georgetown.*

I. Milton Sacks, Communism and Nationalism in Vietnam. *Yale.*

Herbert Pierre Secher, Political Parties in Post-war Austria since 1945. *Wisconsin.*

Will J. Selzer, The Trusteeship Council and Self-Government with Particular Reference to British Administration in Africa. *Pennsylvania.*

F. Burke Sheeran, Intergovernmental Relations in Canada, Australia, and the United States: A Comparative Study of Federal Government. *Southern California.*

Kurt L. Shell, Austrian Socialist Party, 1945–1952. *Columbia.*

Olga C. Sonder, Political Processes and Electoral Procedures under the Indian Republican Constitution Put into Effect on January 26, 1950. *Stanford.*

Herbert G. Sonthoff, Robert von Mohl and the Problem of German Federalism. *Harvard.*

Richard Felix Staar, Political Dynamics in Poland, 1948–1953. *Michigan.*

Kurt Steiner, Local Government in Japan. *Stanford.*

Claude B. Stephenson, Jr., The Use of Technically Competent Committees in Swedish Local Government. *North Carolina.*

Robert Scott Sullivant, The Ukraine and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—A Study in Soviet Policy and Ukrainian Nationalism. *Chicago.*

Joseph Lee Sutton, A Political Biography of Inukai Tsuyoshi. *Michigan.*

Harold M. Thewlis, Authoritarian Tendencies in the French Right, 1924–1940. *Columbia.*

Jack E. Thomas, Evaluation of Soviet Air Power. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert F. Thompson, The Retention and Rejection of Occupation Reforms in Japan after the Signing of the Peace Treaty. *Minnesota.*

Thomas Walter Thorsen, The Administration of Medical and Public Health Services in Scandinavia. *Utah.*

Roy Tollefson, Political Thought in the Norwegian Labor Party (1917–1928). *Chicago.*

George O. Totten, III, The Social Democratic Movement in Pre-War Japan. *Yale.*

Frank Untermyer, The Problem of Federation in the British Central African Colonies. *Chicago.*

Margaret D. Urist, Nationalism in Guatemala. *Southern California.*

Paul W. J. Van der Veur, Minority Groups in the United States of Indonesia. *Minnesota.*

Eric Waldman, The Spartacus Uprising of 1919 and the Crisis of the German Socialist Movement: A Study of the Relation between Political Theory and Party Practice. *George Washington.*

Carlo F. Weiss, Catholic Corporatism in Italy. *Yale.*

Ernst F. Winter, Austrian Agrarian Policy: 1945–1953. *Columbia.*

Ernest Wohlgemuth, The Politics of Labor in West Germany. *Chicago.*

George Elliott Wolff, Executive-Legislative Relations in the Third French Republic, 1920–1940. *North Carolina.*

Laurence Wyatt, Some Freedoms in England Today. *Minnesota.*

Willard Ross Yates, An Examination of the Leading Constitutional and Social Ideas of the Mouvement Republicain Populaire, 1945–1947. *Yale.*

Phoebe Yu, A Comparison of the British and American Personnel Systems. *Chicago.*

Janusz Kazimierz Zawodny, Self-Assertion in the Soviet Factory: Study of Worker Grievances and Their Adjustment. *Stanford.*

Paul Zinner, Communist Strategy and Tactics in Czechoslovakia, 1945–50. *Harvard.*

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, POLITICS AND LAW

Robert L. Abbey, The World Health Organization: A Case Study in the Functional Approach toward International Organization. *Harvard.*

Nazeer Ahmed, Development of Administrative Practices in the United Nations Secretariate. *Kansas.*

Charles E. Allen, The Development and Significance of International Health Collaboration, 1792–1950. *Stanford.*

Luther A. Allen, The French Left and Soviet Russia, 1933–1940. *Chicago.*

Eliece A. Altroggen, Power Politics Concerning Sinkiang, 1860–1946. *Chicago.*

Yilmaz Altug, Turkey and the Development of International Law. *Kentucky.*

Abdul-Malik S. Al-Zaibag, Iraq Oil Politics in the Inter-War Period. *Columbia.*

Charles D. Ameringer, Never Abandon Panama! The Story of Philippe Bunau-Varilla and the Panama Canal. *Fletcher School.*

Nan Louise Grindle Amstutz, The Economics of Socialism. *Fletcher School.*

John A. Armstrong, Ukrainian Nationalism and Disaffection in the Ukraine. *Columbia.*

John P. Armstrong, A Study of Senator Taft's Foreign Policy. *Chicago.*

Clarence W. Baier, Jonathan Russell and the Development of the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1810–1920. *Brown.*

Bettie J. Baker, Toward an Understanding of International Regionalism. *Michigan.*

Arthur C. Banks, Jr., International Law and the Second World War. *Johns Hopkins.*

Irving Barnett, UNRRA's Experience in China. *Columbia.*

Sidney N. Barnett, Judicial Interpretations of the United Nations Charter in International and National Courts. *Columbia.*

George Basich, The Effect of Russian Expansion on British Political Opinion, 1763–1856. *Chicago.*

Frederick O. Beattie, III, The Utility of Theories of Aggression to the Understanding of International Relations. *Chicago.*

Anne B. Beeler, The International Labour Organization; Important Developments in Its Structure, Function and Constitution since 1935. *Cornell.*

John A. Bekker, The Soviet Union and World Organization. *Chicago.*

Aaron Bell, The United States' Doctrine of the Just War. *Chicago.*

George C. Betts, The International Criminal Court. *Syracuse.*

Thompson Black, Prize Law in World War II. *California* (Los Angeles).

Helen A. Blackway, Ideas and Opinion Determinants in Foreign Policy Issues. *Pennsylvania.*

S. Cole Blasier, Soviet Policy toward Cuba and Chile, 1945–1948. *Columbia.*

John D. Blumgart, The Political Consequences of the American Aid in Greece. *Columbia.*

William G. Bowdler, The Quest for Collective Security in the Americas. *Fletcher School.*

James E. Boyce, The United States and the Integrity of China (1898–1908). *Fletcher School.*

Chester P. Bradley, New Trends in British Colonial Policy. *Columbia.*

Ralph Brown, Concepts of Air Superiority. *Georgetown.*

Weldon J. Brown, The Political Aspects of Commercial Trade Controls in Central and South America. *American.*

Bue Brun, International Maritime Policy. *Fletcher School.*

Jean Emile Buckens, The Right of Petition in the Trusteeship System of the United Nations. *Fletcher School.*

Barbara B. Burn, International Law and the Administration of Colonies. *Fletcher School.*

Henry C. Bush, British Opinion Concerning the United States Foreign Policy since 1945. *Chicago.*

Robert O. Byrd, Quaker Alternatives to Official Policy in the Field of International Relations. *Chicago.*

Florencio Campomanes, The Problem of Integration of the Organization of American States into the United Nations. *Georgetown.*

Russell B. Capelle, Formulation of French Foreign Policy under the Fourth Republic. *Boston University.*

George A. Carroll, American Policy Concerning Control of Atomic Energy. *Fletcher School.*

Webster C. Cash, A Comparative Study of the Specialized Agencies in the United Nations: The Relation of Their Functions to Their Organizational Forms. *Chicago.*

Alphonso Castagno, Regional Influences in Italian Foreign Policy. *Columbia.*

Nancy G. Cattell, Soviet Policy and the German Revolution of 1918–19. *Columbia.*

Matthew Cazan, Diplomatic Relations; Roumania–United States, 1940–1950. *Georgetown.*

J. Leo Cefkin, The National Commission of Unesco with Special Emphasis on the United States National Commission for Unesco. *Columbia.*

Yu Nan Chang, A Study of U. S. Security Arrangements in the Far East, 1950–52. *Washington* (Seattle).

Ping-Lang Chao, Finality of International Arbitral Awards. *New York University.*

Chu Pei Chen, The Diplomatic Services of Major Powers. *New York University.*

Kwen Chen, Legal Status, Privileges, and Immunities of the United Nations, Its Related Organizations and Their Personnel. *Michigan.*

Yu-Ching Chen, American Policy and the Collapse of the Nationalist China. *New York University.*

Chieh Yue Chiang, The Concept and Development of International Responsibility for Colonial Administration. *Washington* (Seattle).

Charles K. Chu, Philander Knox's Far Eastern Policy, 1909–1913. *Chicago.*

Martin Clancy, Rules of Warfare Observed by American Military Forces in the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. *Georgetown.*

Joseph I. Coffee, A Case History of Techniques of Soviet Aggression (Poland, 1919–1920). *Georgetown.*

Sidney Coleman, A Study of the Administration of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. *Washington* (Seattle).

George C. Constantinides, The United States and Greece, 1940–47: A Study in Foreign Policy. *Harvard.*

Ralph E. Cook, American Participation in the Lausanne Conference, 1922–23. *Fletcher School.*

Brownlee S. Corrin, The United Nations, the United States, and the U.S.S.R. from Dumbarton Oaks to Korea: A Study in Controversy and Cooperation. *Stanford.*

Morton H. Cowden, Soviet and Comintern Policy toward the British Labor Movement, 1917–26. *Columbia.*

Richard F. Crabbs, Administrative Aspects of Technical Assistance. *Stanford.*

Martin G. Cramer, TCA Program in India. *Fletcher School.*

Claude B. Cross, The United States and the North Atlantic Pact. *Iowa.*

Frank J. Curtis, Jr., The Role of Argentina in the United Nations. *Pennsylvania.*

William B. Dale, Full Employment and American Foreign Policy. *Fletcher School.*

William M. David, Jr., U. S. Policy toward the Baltic States, 1917–1922. *Columbia.*

James F. Davidson, Edmund Burke's Theory of International Relations. *Chicago.*

Margaret M. Davies, The Role of the American Trade Union Representatives in the Aid-to-Greece Program. *Washington* (Seattle).

Grant R. Davy, Canadian Policies in the United Nations. *Fletcher School.*

Francois M. Dickman, The Economic Foreign Policy of the United States in Western Europe from 1945 to 1948. *Fletcher School.*

Anatole Dinbergs, The Pattern of Annexation by the Soviet Union. *Georgetown.*

Dorothy Dodge, The Recognition of the "People's Government" in China: A Problem of International Law and Politics. *Minnesota.*

Joseph F. Dolecki, Polish Foreign Policy, 1932–1945. *New York University.*

Herbert W. Dowd, The Native Land and Labor Policies of the South African Administration of South West Africa. *Fletcher School.*

Arthur E. Dowell, Appeasement and Conciliation in Global Crises, 1938–1948. *Chicago.*

Margaret W. Dower, Neutrality in Small European Nations. *Boston University.*

Edward Drake, The Soviet Alliance System. *New York University.*

Wilbert B. Dubin, The Rise of Post-War Political Stratifications in Southeast Asia. *Georgetown.*

Frederick B. Dunn, Franco-British Relations in Southeast Asia, 1863–1904. *Chicago.*

John Edmund Dwan, Military Planning and Foreign Policy: The Search for Rationality in Strategic Judgments. *Yale.*

Stanley W. Dziuban, United States–Canadian Military Cooperation. *Columbia.*

Charles P. Edwards, The Western Powers and the Italo-Abyssinian Affair. *Fletcher School.*

Harold E. Engle, The Place of International Administration in the Structure of International Politics: A Critical Study of "Functionalism." *Columbia.*

Phoebe Everett, International Administration: A Comparative Study of the Caribbean and South Pacific Commissions. *Syracuse.*

Bernard Fall, The Post-War Problem of Indo-China. *Syracuse.*

Thomas S. Farr, European Federation: Proposals and Prospects. *Chicago.*

Milton Feder, Great Power Relations in the Origin and Development of the Kingdom of Lybia. *Michigan.*

Mark Cecil Iselin Feer, India's Policy toward China since 1949. *Fletcher School.*

Vernon L. Ferwerda, United Nations Settlement of Armed Conflict: Palestine, Indonesia, Kashmir. *Harvard.*

Edmund S. Finegold, The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. *Harvard.*

Lawrence S. Finkelstein, Indonesia and the United States. *Columbia.*

Michael J. Flach, The Slav Congresses and Pan-Slavism, 1848–1914. *Fletcher School.*

Arthur Frank, United States and Czechoslovak Foreign Relations. *Utah.*

Robert W. Frase, Proposals for the International Control of Atomic Energy. *Harvard.*

C. Dale Fuller, The Soviet Union's Concept of the League of Nations as an Instrumentality for the Maintenance of Peace, 1934–1939. *Columbia.*

Arthur Funston, The United Nations and Human Rights. *Indiana.*

John O. Gallagher, United States Monetary and Financial Diplomacy and the Failure of the World Monetary and Economic Conference of 1933. *Fletcher School.*

Richard F. Gardner, The Relations of the United States and Spain from 1898 to 1948. *Fletcher School.*

Tesfay Gebre-egziabhier, Constitutional Developments in Relation to Treaties after 1945. *Fletcher School.*

Charles Gendreau, Agricultural Settlement and Colonization in Latin American National Development Programs. *Minnesota.*

Victor H. Gibean, Cuban-American Relations during the First World War. *North Carolina.*

John S. Gibson, The Impact of Regional and Limited Security Arrangements upon the United Nations as an International Peace and Security Organization. *Columbia.*

Eggert W. Giere, The American Policy toward the Negotiation and Conclusion of a Peace Contract with Germany following World War II. *Washington* (Seattle).

John S. Gillespie, The Role of the Director-General in the Development of the International Labor Office. *Columbia.*

Meredith Gilpatrick, Military Strategy on the Western Front, 1871–1914. *Chicago.*

Edward Glick, The Policy of the Latin American Governments toward Israel in the United Nations. *Florida.*

Robert Goerder, Impact of Air Power in Korea on Chinese and Korean Troops as Evident in Prisoner of War Interrogation Reports. *Georgetown.*

Elliott R. Goodman, The Bolshevik Concept of a World State. *Columbia.*

Marjorie H. Gordon, The New Japanese Constitution. *Indiana.*

Robert C. Gordon, The North Atlantic Treaty Organization: A Study in Comparative International Organization. *California* (Berkeley).

Budda V. Govindaraj, The Role of India in the Settlement of Disputes within the United Nations. *Michigan.*

Angelina Grammatico, The United Nations and the Development of Human Rights. *New York University.*

Morris A. Greene, The Transfer of a Functioning International Organization from One Site to Another. *American.*

Frances A. Gulick, Agrarian Problems in Indonesia. *Fletcher School.*

Merle Gulick, The Foreign Policy of Senator Connally. *Georgetown.*

Eric J. Haas, The Modern Problem of Intervention. *New York University.*

William C. Hamilton, Making Foreign Policy in Pressure Groups. *Yale.*

Pyo-Wook Han, Post-War Developments in Korean Government. *Michigan.*

Thomas H. Handy, Russia and Postwar Anglo-American Relations. *Texas.*

John Hanessian, Jr., The Question of Western European Integration. *Syracuse.*

Milan E. Hapala, The Russian Question and the Evolution of Czechoslovak Political Parties. *Duke.*

Maurice Harari, Anglo-Egyptian Relations, 1936–1951. *Columbia.*

Clifford Harding, The World Position of Iran as Effected by the Work of Reza Shah. *New York University.*

Bruce B. Harlow, Determinants in International Relations: An Inquiry into Fundamentals. *Columbia.*

Don Harris, International Economic Cooperation in Europe, 1814–1950. *California* (Berkeley).

Bartlett Harvey, Foreign Policy and Public Opinion; The Shift in Policy toward the German Economy, 1945–1948. *Harvard.*

Gene S. Haugse, Treaties of Alliance. *Nebraska.*

Robert D. Hayton, Relations between Argentina and Chile. *California* (Berkeley).

Joseph A. Hearst, American Policy in Occupied Italy. *Columbia.*

William A. Helseth, United States Embassy in Berlin, 1921–1933. *Fletcher School.*

William Henderson, Eleven Days to Pearl Harbor: A Study of Crisis Government in America. *Columbia.*

Frederick Herman, The Victors and the Vanquished: The Quest for Security as Illustrated by Three Allied Occupations of Territory of Defeated Powers: France, 1815–1818; Germany, 1918–1929 and Germany, 1945–. *Fletcher School.*

Edward Hermberg, Hans Kelsen's Theory of the Development of International Law and Organization: An Analysis of Its Position within His General Theory of Law and the State. *Yale.*

Robert Herrera, Latin American Territorial Disputes in International Law. *Columbia.*

Wilhelm G. Hertz, The Swiss Conception of International Law. *Columbia.*

Raul Hilberg, The Destruction of the European Jews. *Columbia.*

Conrad P. Homberger, A Theory of International Relations. *Columbia.*

Robert Hopkirk, Functional Regionalism: A Pattern of International Organization in the Economic and Social Fields of the United Nations. *New York University.*

Robert J. Horgan, American Thought on the Soviet Union, 1933–1939. *Notre Dame.*

Thomas Hovet, Jr., The Development of International Organization in the Field of Intergovernmental Commodity (Food) Arrangements. *New York University.*

Allen Hovey, Jr., Politics of Unity: The European Movement and the Council of Europe. *Columbia.*

John M. Howell, The Development of the Concept of Domestic Jurisdiction. *Duke.*

Albert J. Hoyt, The Role of Regionalism in Contemporary World Politics. *Southern California.*

William Y. Huang, The Role of China in the Origin and Development of the U.N. *Michigan.*

Robert P. Huff, Diplomatic Relations between Spain and the United States, 1945–1953. *Stanford.*

Otis Hung-i-Shao, Henry L. Stimson's Far Eastern Policy, 1929–1933. *Brown.*

Dunning Idle, IV, Indonesian Neutralism and the Cold War. *Yale.*

Thomas A. Israel, The Implications of the Social Contract Theory for International Organization. *Illinois.*

Harold K. Jacobson, The Impact of the Soviet Union on the Economic and Social Activities of the United Nations. *Yale.*

Louis C. James, Relations of the North American Railroads: A Study in International Cooperation of the Railroads of Canada, Mexico and the United States. *Columbia.*

Ernest John, Some Aspects of General Staff Liaison in Coalition Warfare. *Georgetown.*

Raymond V. Johnson, Development and Administration of the International Broadcasting Program of the United States. *Stanford.*

Doris W. Jones, The First Moroccan Crisis and the Foreign Policy of Theodore Roosevelt. *Fletcher School.*

Charles Katsainos, Russia's Pan-Slavism: Theory and Practice in the Light of Russia's Balkan Expansionism up to 1912. *Georgetown.*

Pierre Keller, National Attitudes toward Western European Integration. *Yale.*

George H. Kelly, The Union Française and French Colonial Policy. *Stanford.*

Jesse C. Kennedy, American Foreign Policy in China, 1937–1950: An Analysis of Why It Failed. *Chicago.*

Lu Yu Kiang, A Critical Study of the Operation of the United Nations Trusteeship System, with Special Reference to the Methods of Supervision over the Administering Authorities. *New York University.*

E. Darrell Killen, Pacific Security Alternatives as Seen through Australian Eyes. *Chicago.*

Chonghan Kim, Prince Konoye and Japanese Foreign Policy, with Special Reference to the Period 1937–1941. *Indiana.*

Chase Kimball, A Commentary on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. *Fletcher School.*

Alvin Knepper, John Gilbert Winant and International Social Justice. *New York University.*

Ross Y. Koen, The China Lobby and the Formulation of American Foreign Policy, 1945–1951. *Florida.*

Maximilian Koessler, The Dachau Trials: A Study of the War Crime Trials. *Columbia.*

Kwang Lim Koh, International Regulation of Fisheries, with Special Reference to Those in the North Pacific Ocean. *Rutgers.*

Leon Koruciewicz, Polish-German Diplomatic Relations, 1934–1939. *California* (Berkeley).

Irving Kramer, Problems of the Japanese Peace Treaty. *Columbia.*

Lawrence Lazar, International Law and Diplomatic Asylum. *Fletcher School.*

Luke Tsung-Chou Lee, The Development of the Consular Institution, 1931–1951. *Fletcher School.*

Pichon Pei-Yung Leh, China: Its Westernization and Nationalism, 1919–1926. *Chicago.*

Bruce LeMessurier, The United States Senate and America's Latin American Policy, 1938–1950. *Chicago.*

Sigrid Leube, The Position of Non-Member States with Regard to International Organizations: The League of Nations and the United Nations. *New York University.*

Hua-Wei Li, The Development of Economic and Social Rights by the United Nations. *New York University.*

Paul Ta-Kuang Lin, Problems in the Policy of the British Commonwealth toward the Japanese Empire, 1921–1941. *Harvard.*

Arthur W. Lindsley, The Problem of Control over Current Methods at Conflict between Nations. *New York University.*

Seward Ling, The Administrative Tribunal at the United Nations. *New York University.*

Raymond McDuffee, The Department of State and the Russian Revolution (March-November, 1917), *Georgetown.*

Stuart H. McIntyre, Legal Effect of War on Treaties. *Columbia.*

Raymond D. Mack, The Development of the Inter-American Regional System: The Contribution of the Jurists. *Indiana.*

Joseph C. McKenna, S. J., Diplomatic Protest as an Instrument of United States Foreign Policy. *Yale.*

Charles B. McLane, Soviet Policy towards the Chinese Communists, 1935–1949. *Columbia.*

Charles H. McLaughlin, Principles of Treaty Interpretation. *Columbia.*

David S. McLellan, The French (Non-Communist) Image of American Foreign Policy. *Yale.*

Dagmar McNown, The Military and Diplomatic Struggle for the Boundaries of Czechoslovakia. *California* (Los Angeles).

P. D. Madhani, Expropriation of Property under International Law. *Columbia.*

Alfredo Manat, The Relations of the United States and the Philippines since the Coming into Effect of the Commonwealth Act, 1935–1950. *Chicago.*

Yunan Mao, The Principle of Sovereign Equality in the United Nations. *Chicago.*

Melvin M. Marcus, Voting Procedure in the Practice of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations. *Michigan.*

John L. Martin, Legal and Diplomatic Control of International Propaganda. *Minnesota.*

Laurence Martin, Anglo-American Liberalism and the Allied Peace Program of 1918. *Yale.*

Gerald Maryanov, Domestic Jurisdiction in the United Nations. *Indiana.*

Arno Mayer, The Spectre of Communism at Versailles. *Yale.*

William S. McCrea, A Comparative Study of the Mexican Oil Expropriation of 1938 and the Iranian Oil Nationalization of 1951. *Georgetown.*

Irene W. Meister, Soviet Union's Policy in the Near East since the End of World War II. *Fletcher School.*

Thomas P. Melady, Role of Taxation in the Development of Underdeveloped Countries. *Catholic University.*

Everett K. Melby, The Refugees in Western Germany. *Chicago.*

Earl Thomas Millen, The Impact of Tensions upon International Relations and Organization. *Washington* (Seattle).

Frances Mond, The United Nations Commission on Human Rights. *Columbia.*

Glenn Guy Morgan, An Evaluation of the Role of the Specialized Organizations of the Organization of American States. *Virginia.*

Andrew J. Morse, An Analysis of British Opinion in Reaction to the American Initiative during the Postwar Years. *Chicago.*

Norman W. Mosher, State Trading and Great Britain: A Case Study of State Trading, Methods of its Implementation, the Effects on the National Economy, and its Relation to Multilateral Trade. *Fletcher School.*

Daniel P. Moynihan, United States and the International Labor Organization. *Fletcher School.*

Robert J. Myers, The Political Philosophy of Japan's Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere. *Chicago.*

Hossein Nazem, Neutrality of Iran. *Columbia.*

Inez Nelson, The Security of Small States. *Chicago.*

Norman W. Nelson, Subsidies to Producers as a Substitute for Tariffs. *Fletcher School.*

Randall H. Nelson, United States Practice in the Negotiation and Conclusion of International Agreements since 1940. *Michigan.*

Benjamin Nimer, Walter Lippmann: International Relations in Theory and Practice. *Chicago.*

Leon Novar, Great Power Conflicts in Iran, 1920–1921 and 1943–1947: A Comparison. *Chicago.*

Grady H. Nunn, International Administration in the Western Hemisphere. *New York University.*

Alfred G. Obern, International Regional Organizations: A Study in International Administration. *American.*

James F. O'Brien, The London Economic Conference of 1933. *Georgetown.*

William O'Brien, Some Contemporary Aspects of the Principle of Military Necessity. *Georgetown.*

Irwin Oder, The United States and the Palestine Mandate, 1920–1948. *Columbia.*

Eric H. Olson, The New Colonial Administration of West Africa. *Syracuse.*

Roy Olton, Africa in American Foreign Relations during the Nineteenth Century. *Fletcher School.*

Wladimir Onecewicz, The Diplomatic and Military Preparation of the Attack on Poland by Germany and Russia in 1939. *Georgetown.*

Mark T. Orr, The Administration of Japanese Education under the Occupation. *North Carolina.*

Gene D. Overstreet, The Soviet View of India and Communist Policy in India: A Study of Strategy and Tactics. *Columbia.*

Robert von Pagenhardt, The Executive Office and Powers of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. *Stanford.*

Alex A. Palamiotis, Recent Developments in the Law of Territorial Waters. *Utah.*

R. V. Patwardhan, Possible Development of a Regional System in South East Asia. *New York University.*

Oscar Perlmutter, The Foreign Policy of Dean Acheson: A Case Study in the Conduct of Foreign Relations in a Democracy. *Chicago.*

Maria Perry, Prelude to War in Eastern Europe: Romania and the Powers, 1931–1941. *Columbia.*

Robert J. Peterson, The Status of Manchuria since 1931. *Chicago.*

Jack C. Plano, The United Nations and the India-Pakistan Dispute. *Wisconsin.*

Emil R. Platig, The Philosophy of International Relations of John Foster Dulles. *Chicago.*

Adamantia Pollis, The Effects of Great Power Policy on Greek Nationalism. *Johns Hopkins.*

John A. Power, Financing of the United Nations and Its Specialized Agencies. *Catholic University.*

G. S. Rao, The Coordination of Specialized Agencies and the United Nations: A Case Study in Technical Assistance Programme. *Columbia.*

E. Haynes Reynolds, The Impact of the East-West Conflict in the Middle East. *Southern California.*

George H. Ried, Administration of an International Police Force. *Syracuse.*

Najmuddin Rifai, Lybia—Road to Independence. *Columbia.*

Walter L. Riley, An Analysis of the Law of the International Military Tribunal of the Far East. *Washington* (Seattle).

Dorothy Roberts, An Analysis of the Bi-Partisan Foreign Policy as a Method of Conduct of the Foreign Relations of the United States. *Chicago.*

Seymour Rotter, Soviet and Comintern Policy toward Germany, 1919–1923: A Case Study of Strategy and Tactics. *Columbia.*

Paul Rupprecht, The International Position of Hungary in the U. S. Foreign Policy, 1933–1947. *Minnesota.*

Donald E. Russell, Revolution in China: A Study in American Reactions. *Chicago.*

Marina Salvin, The Soviet Challenge in the Balkans. *Columbia.*

Isamu Sato, The Impact of International Relations upon the Government and Politics of Japan. *Chicago.*

Charles E. Savige, A Study into the Obligatory Character of Resolutions Passed by the Principal Organs of the League of Nations and the United Nations. *Florida.*

Warner R. Schilling, Admirals and Foreign Policy, 1914–1919. *Yale.*

Donald H. Scott, The Cultural Relations Program of the United States in Mexico. *Southern California.*

William E. Scott, French Policy and the Soviet Pact, 1931–1935. *Yale.*

Esther Seeman, The Administration of the Minorities Treaties by the League of Nations and Its Implications for the United Nations. *Minnesota.*

Charles B. Selak, Jr., Reservations to Multilateral Treaties. *Columbia.*

Hari P. Sharma, India's Quest for Security and Peace. *Fletcher School.*

Donald Shea, The Calvo Clause. *Minnesota.*

Barbara J. Shockley, The Creation of a European Nationality. *Pennsylvania.*

Joginder Singh, Domestic Jurisdiction and the Law of the United Nations. *Michigan.*

Herman T. Skofield, Private Foreign Investment. *Fletcher School.*

Donald G. Smith, The Status of the Inhabitants of the Trust Areas: A Legal, Social, Economic and Political Study. *Minnesota.*

Gordon L. Spangler, The Washington Conference: A Case Study of Anglo-American Relations. *Fletcher School.*

Donald T. Sparks, The Protestants as an Active Factor in International Relations and in American Foreign Policy Formulation. *Chicago.*

Cummins Speakman, An Investigation of American Official Information on Political Extremism in Germany during the Weimar Period, with Special Emphasis on the First Six Years (1918–1924) and the Final Phase (1930–1933). *Yale.*

George Stoney Springsteen, Jr., The British Navigation Laws: The Influence of Foreign Nations upon Their Modification and Repeal, 1783–1849: A Study in Commercial Policy. *Fletcher School.*

Emil Starr, The British Labour Party and the Soviet Union, 1939–1949. *Chicago.*

Robert B. Stauffer, Manchuria as a Political Entity. *Minnesota.*

George W. Steckel, The U. N. General Assembly: Its Powers and Functions. *Johns Hopkins.*

David J. Steinberg, Foreign Procurement and the Stockpiling of Strategic Materials. *Harvard.*

Elizabeth I. Sterenberg, The Role of Forced Labor in Economic Development. *Chicago.*

Virgil H. Stevens, Personnel Problems Peculiar to International Agencies: A Study in International Administration. *Southern California.*

Jonathan D. Stoddart, The Influence of Immigrant Groups on United States Foreign Policy. *Fletcher School.*

John G. Stoessinger, Post World War II Refugee Problem. *Harvard.*

Lois J. Stone, The Development of Limitations on the Right to Resort to the Use of Armed Force in International Law. *Columbia.*

Marvin R. Summers, United States Policy toward Communism in China. *Iowa.*

Phillips Talbot, The Foreign Policy of India since Independence. *Chicago.*

Howard J. Taubenfeld, International Legal Problems of Collective Action by International Organizations. *Columbia.*

Loren E. Tesdell, The Middle East and Technical Cooperation. *Stanford.*

Barbara J. Teters, Japanese Politics and Treaty Revision, 1870–1895. *Washington* (Seattle).

Joseph M. Thom, The International Legal Status of the Refugee. *Washington* (St. Louis).

William W. Thomas, Francis Lieber and the International Law of Land Warfare. *North Carolina.*

Joseph M. Thomashefsky, The International Legal Protection of Refugees. *New York University.*

K. B. Y. Thotappa, Policy and Programme Coordination of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies, with a Special Focus on the Role of the Economic and Social Council. *Chicago.*

Clarence E. Thurber, Contributions of the State of California to the Point Four Program. *Stanford.*

Donald R. Toussaint, The French Contribution to the Political Unification of Europe, 1944–1953. *Stanford.*

Erwin W. Umbach, A Study of the Foreign Relations of the United States with Austria. *Fletcher School.*

Juliane von K. Valentin, German-Japanese Relations in the Period between the Two World Wars. *Pennsylvania.*

John P. Vloyantes, The Security-Power Dilemma in International Organization, with Special Reference to Article XI of the Charter of the United Nations. *Utah.*

G. Hans Voelkel, Discrimination against Aliens in International Law. *Columbia.*

Kalman Von Voros, The Origins of the Munich Pact of 1938. *Georgetown.*

Austin F. Walter, Australia's Relations with the United States, 1941–1949. *Michigan.*

James L. Weber, The Development of the Foreign Policy Objectives of the British Labor Party, 1919–1939. *Fletcher School.*

Clarence N. Weems, Jr., The Korean Revolution. *Columbia.*

Melvin A. Weightman, The Present Status of the Concept of Self-Defense in International Law. *Pennsylvania.*

Paul Welty, Theodore Roosevelt's Concepts of the National Interests of the United States. *Chicago.*

John E. Westburg, General Theory and Practice of Modern Federalism. *Southern California.*

Ponnambalam Wignaraja, The Conflict between Economic Rationality and Cultural Values: An Analysis of Four Policies for Increasing the Availability of Domestic Savings for Developmental Needs. *Yale.*

Robert Wilfong, UNRRA and Displaced Persons. *Harvard.*

F. Haydn Williams, Air Power and American Foreign Policy: The Berlin Air Lift. *Fletcher School.*

Maurice J. Williams, The Problem of Economic Integration in Western Europe. *Chicago.*

Ann R. Willner, Problems in Agricultural Production for the Domestic Market in Venezuela. *Chicago.*

Martin W. Wilmington, Regional Cooperation for Supply and Development in the Middle East During World War II (The Middle East Supply Center). *New York University.*

Harry Winkler, The Political Orientation of Israel in the Struggle between East and West. *Chicago.*

William D. S. Witte, Quaker Pacifism in the United States, 1914–1941, with Special Reference to its Relation to Isolationism and Internationalism. *Columbia.*

Klaus Wolf, Pioneer Entrepreneurs in Industry: A Study in the Sociology of Industrialization. *Chicago.*

Gregory B. Wolfe, The Montevideo Conference, 1933: Reactions of the North and South American Press to Foreign Policy of the United States. *Fletcher School.*

Claude Woltz, Bloc Action in the United Nations. *New York University.*

Wah Wong, The Problem of "Self-Determination" in the United Nations. *New York University.*

Helen L. Wood, British Concepts of Internationalism in the Nineteenth Century. *Northwestern.*

Herbert H. Wood, Jr., International Supervision of Colonial Administrative Unions. *Columbia.*

Theodore P. Wright, Franklin Roosevelt and the Ideal of Collective Security. *Yale.*

Pamela N. Wrinch, Winston (Leonard) Spencer Churchill as a Theoretician in the Field of International Relations. *Yale.*

David Wurfel, The Bell Report and After: A Study in the Political Problems of Social Reform through Foreign Aid. *Cornell.*

Agnes Hwun-giat Yao, Comparison of Mandates and Trusteeship. *Chicago.*

Abraham Yeselson, United States-Persian Diplomatic Relations, 1883–1921. *Brown.*

Tien-Cheng Young, The Use of Scientific Management Concepts in International Administration. *New York University.*

II. DISSERTATIONS COMPLETED SINCE THE LAST LISTING

POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Charles Blitzer; A.B., Williams, 1946; A.M., Harvard, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Political Thought of James Harrington. *Harvard.*

Joan V. Bondurant; A.B., B.Mus., Michigan, 1942; Ph.D., California (Berkeley), 1952. Gandhian Satyagraha and Political Theory. *California* (Berkeley).

Frederic S. Burin, II; B.S.S., C.C.N.Y., 1942; A.M., Syracuse, 1946; Ph.D., Columbia, 1952. The Rule of Law in German Constitutional Thought: A Study in Comparative Jurisprudence. *Columbia.*

Edward R. Cain; A.B., Boston U., 1948; A.M., Columbia, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. The Rationalist Conception of Freedom in the

Political Theory of Bernard Bosanquet. *Columbia.*

Charles W. Cassinelli, Jr.; A.B., University of California, 1948; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. Representative Government: The Concept and Its Implications. *Harvard.*

Raymond Francis Cour, C.S.C.; A.B., Notre Dame, 1937; A.M., *ibid.*, 1943; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Catholic Action and Politics in the Writings of Pope Pius XI. *Notre Dame.*

Herbert A. Deane; A.B., Columbia, 1942; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Political Ideas of Harold J. Laski. *Columbia.*

Emmett E. Dorsey; A.B., Oberlin, 1927; A.M., Columbia, 1934; Ph.D., American, 1953. The Evolution of the Concept of the Welfare State in the United States since 1890. *American.*

Ursula von Eckardt; B.A., Hunter College, 1946; M.A., The New School, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Inalienable Right to the Pursuit of Happiness: The Meaning of the Concept Examined in the Declaration of Independence and in Related Texts. *The New School.*

Morton J. Frisch; B. A. Roosevelt College, 1949; M.A., University of Chicago, 1949; Ph.D., Pennsylvania State, 1953. Lincoln's Principles of Statecraft. *Pennsylvania State.*

Margaret Guiton; B.A., Bryn Mawr, 1939; M.A., Chicago, 1940; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. Alain: A Theory of the Radical Republic. *Harvard.*

Mont Judd Harmon; A.B., Utah State Agricultural College, 1948; M.S., Wisconsin, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Harold L. Ickes: A Case Study in New Deal Thought. *Wisconsin.*

Harry V. Jaffa; B.A., Yale, 1939; Ph.D., The New School, 1951. Thomism and Aristotelianism: A Study of the Commentary by St. Thomas Aquinas on the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle. *The New School.*

Henry L. Janssen; A. B., Oklahoma. 1943; M.A., *ibid.*, 1947; Ph.D., California (Berkeley), 1953. Political Parties and the Public Interest. *California* (Berkeley).

Duncan M. Kennedy; B.A., Bloomfield College, 1937; M.S.Sc., The New School, 1946; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1949. Principles of Burke's Political Philosophy, with Special Reference to Natural Law. *The New School.*

Ralph Lerner; A.B., Chicago, 1947; A.M., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Political Zionism: The Thought of Pinsker and Herzl. *Chicago.*

Jay Benjamin Lieberman; A.B., Illinois, 1935; Ph.D., Stanford, 1952. Changing Conceptions of Freedom of the Press. *Stanford.*

Paul Mandelstam; A.B., Harvard, 1944; M.D., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Freudian Impact upon Contemporary Political Ideas. *Harvard.*

James G. March; A.B., Wisconsin, 1949; M.A., Yale, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Autonomy as a Factor in Group Organization: A Study in Politics. *Yale.*

David Mars; A.B., Rutgers, 1949; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. The Political Philosophy of Benjamin N. Cardozo. *Rutgers.*

Ralph M. Miwa; A.B., Hawaii, 1948; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *Johns Hopkins*, 1953. The Ideology of Imperialism and Its Significance for Constitutionalism in Japan. *Johns Hopkins.*

George S. Parthemos; A.B., Erskine, 1946; A.M., South Carolina, 1950; Ph.D., North Carolina, 1953. Greek Theories of Property and Some of Their Repercussions. *North Carolina.*

Orville F. Poland; A.B., Harvard, 1942; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., California (Berkeley), 1953. The Public Interest and Recent United States Agricultural Policy: A Study in Pluralism. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert L. Politzer; A.B., Washington, 1941; M.A., *ibid.*, 1942; Ph.D., Columbia, 1947; D.S.Sc., The New School, 1950. Rousseau's *Lettre à D'Alembert sur les Spectacles:* A Discussion and Interpretation. *The New School.*

Roger P. Quilty, C.S.C.; A.B., Notre Dame, 1944; M.A., Catholic, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Influence of Hugues Felicite de Lamennais' Epistemology on his Theory of Democracy. *Catholic.*

Melvin Richter; B.A., Harvard, 1943; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Political Philosophy of T. H. Green. *Harvard.*

Edgar Robinson; A.B., Amherst, 1941; A.M., Columbia, 1942; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. John Dewey's Political Thought. *Columbia.*

Herbert J. Spiro; A.B., Harvard, 1949; A.M., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. A Theory of Responsibility in Government. *Harvard.*

Jay W. Stein; A.B., Minnesota, 1942; A.M., Stanford, 1949; Ph.D., Columbia, 1952. The Ideologues, Their Theories and Politics. *Columbia.*

Howard B. White; A.B., Hamilton College, 1934; M.S.Sc., The New School, 1938; D.S.Sc., *ibid.*, 1943. Prediction and Political Power. *The New School.*

W. Howard Wriggins; A.B., Dartmouth, 1940; A.M., Yale, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Image of the Ideal Communist Militant as Depicted in Communist Party Publications. *Yale.*

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS OF THE UNITED STATES AND ITS DEPENDENCIES

Charles P. Blackmore; A.B., Columbia, 1938; A.M., *ibid.*, 1939; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Joseph B. Shannon, Political Boss and Twentieth Century "Jeffersonian." *Columbia.*

Loic Bouvard; Bachelier en Droit, Université de Paris, 1950; Diplomé l'Institut d'Etudes Politiques, *ibid.*, 1951; Ph.D., Princeton, 1953. Regionalism in Theory and Practice. *Princeton.*

Marion Ashby Buck; A.B., Radcliffe, 1930; A.M., Syracuse, 1931; Ph.D., Radcliffe, 1953. An American Experiment—Cooperation for Health. *Radcliffe.*

Marie B. Chatham; A.B., George Washington, 1947; M.A., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., Maryland, 1953. The National Party Chairman. *Maryland.*

Reo M. Christenson; A.B., Redlands, 1948; A.M., Michigan, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Brannan Plan: A Study in Program-Formulating and Opinion-Influencing Activities of the Department of Agriculture. *Michigan.*

Edward F. Cooke; A.B., Middlebury College, 1947; A.M., Brown, 1949: Ph.D., Northwestern, 1953. The Platform and Resolutions Committees of the 1952 National Political Conventions. *Northwestern.*

Cecil V. Crabb, Jr.; A.B., Centre College; M.A., Vanderbilt, 1950; Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1952. Bi-Partisan Foreign Policy and the Two Party System. *Johns Hopkins.*

Dale G. Fallon; A.B., Michigan State, 1942; A.M., Buffalo University, 1946; Ph.D., Notre Dame, 1952. The Atomic Energy Act of 1945: A Study of Public Policy in the Field of Labor-Management Relations. *Notre Dame.*

Morris D. Forkosch; B.A., New York University, 1936; M.A., *ibid.*, 1938; J.S.D., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., The New School, 1952. The Consumer's Interest in the Sherman Antitrust Act. *The New School.*

Hubert S. Gibbs; B.A., Iowa; M.A., Minnesota; Ph.D., Johns Hopkins, 1952. Advice and Consent: A Study of Congressional-Executive Liaison in Foreign Policy. *Johns Hopkins.*

James H. Grisham; B.A., Texas, 1936; M.A., Texas Christian, 1941; Ph.D., Texas, 1953. Crime Control: A Study in American Federalism. *Texas.*

Paul Y. Hammond; B.A., Utah, 1949; A.M., Harvard, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Secretaryships of War and the Navy: Civilian Control of the Military. *Harvard.*

John P. Hendrickson; B.A., Iowa, 1947; M.A., Minnesota, 1949; Ph.D., Iowa, 1952. Legislative Record of Republicans in the 73rd Congress in Relation to the Republican Platform of 1932 and the Campaign Speeches of Mr. Hoover. *Iowa.*

Morton H. Leeds; B.S.S., C.C.N.Y., 1944; M.A., The New School, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1950. The American Federation of Labor in National Politics. *The New School.*

Genevieve C. Linebarger; A.B., Duke, 1945; M.A., Johns Hopkins, 1949; Ph.D., Maryland, 1953. The Federal Government in American Fiction, 1900–1950. *Maryland.*

J. John McDermott; LL.B., Fordham, 1927; B.S., New York University, 1934; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Treaty Power in Relation to Revenue and Appropriation Laws. *New York University.*

Timothy L. McDonnell; A.B., Gonzaga University, 1942; A.M., *ibid.*, 1943; Ph.D., St. Louis University, 1953. A Case History of the Legislative Process: The Wagner Housing Act of 1937. *St. Louis University.*

William McIntosh; B.A., Rust College, 1942; M.A., Minnesota, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Development of Political Democracy in Puerto Rico. *Minnesota.*

Bruce B. Mason; B.S., North Texas State College, 1947; M.A., Texas Christian, 1949; Ph.D., Texas, 1953. American Political Protest, 1932–1936. *Texas.*

Donald R. Matthews; A.B., Princeton, 1948; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. United States Senators: A Study of the Recruitment of Political Leaders. *Princeton.*

Richard Neustadt; A.B., California, 1939; A.M., Harvard, 1942; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Presidential Clearance of Legislation. *Harvard.*

Harold L. Olson; B.S., Duluth State Teachers College, 1942; M.A., Colorado, 1948; Ph.D., Nebraska, 1953. Federal-State Cooperative

Finance for Public Programs in Nebraska. *Nebraska.*

Paul J. Piccard; B.A., Minnesota, 1947; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., Texas, 1953. The Constitutional and Political Status of the Electoral College. *Texas.*

Albert G. Pickerell; B.S., Kansas State Teachers College, 1934; M.S., *ibid.*, 1935; Ph.D., Stanford, 1952. The Battle for Men's Minds: America's "Psychological Offensive" in the "Cold War." *Stanford.*

Rob R. Ratliff; A.B., American, 1948; A.M., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Defense Production Act of 1950: An Administrative Study. *American.*

William P. Robinson; A.B., Howard, 1932; A.M., *ibid.*, 1935; Ph.D., New York University, 1953. Limitations on Judicial Review. *New York University.*

Burton M. Sapin; A.B., Columbia, 1945; A.M., *ibid.*, 1947; M.A., Princeton, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Role of the Military Establishment in the Japanese Peace Treaty: A Case Study in American Foreign Policy Decision-Making. *Princeton.*

Frank P. Sherwood; A.B., Dartmouth, 1943; M.S., Southern California, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. The Public Relations of the Office of Price Stabilization—A Study of the Support-Building Process. *Southern California.*

Allan P. Sindler; A.B., Harvard, 1948; A.M., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Politics of Louisiana, 1920–1952. *Harvard.*

Maynard O. Smith; Ph.B., Wisconsin, 1940; Ph.M., *ibid.*, 1946; Ph.D., The New School, 1953. Principles of Republican Government in the Federalist. *The New School.*

C. Kenneth Snyder; A.B., Ursinus, 1940; Ph.D., Cornell, 1952. The Department of State and the Congress. *Cornell.*

Edwin Stillings; A.B., Hiram College (Ohio), 1942; A.M., Chicago, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Electoral Tides and Turnout. *Chicago.*

Kenneth N. Vines; B.A., Birmingham-Southern College, 1946; M.A., Kentucky, 1947; Ph.D., Minnesota, 1953. The Role of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America in the Formation of American National Policy. *Minnesota.*

John D. Williams; A.B., Stanford, 1946; M.P.A., Harvard, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Politics of Economic Stabilization in the United States: A Study of Fiscal Policy. *Harvard.*

CONSTITUTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW IN THE UNITED STATES

Mabra G. Abernathy; B.S., Birmingham-Southern College, 1942; A.M., Alabama, 1947; Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1953. Freedom of Assembly. *Wisconsin.*

Doris S. Blaisdell; A.B., American, 1944; A.M., Wisconsin, 1945; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Constitutional Law of Mr. Justice McReynolds. *Wisconsin.*

William W. Boyer, Jr.; A.B., College of Wooster, 1947; A.M., Wisconsin, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Church-State Relations in Wisconsin. *Wisconsin.*

Alfred O. Canon; A.B., Southwestern at Memphis, 1944; A.M., Duke, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Constitutional Thought of Wiley Rutledge. *Duke.*

Janice E. Christensen; B.A., Minnesota, 1944; M.A., *ibid.*, 1946; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. The Constitutional Problems of National Control of the Suffrage in the United States. *Minnesota.*

Richard A. Edwards; A.B., Indiana, 1947; LL.B., Harvard, 1949; Ph.D., Columbia, 1952. The Effect of an Unreasonable Search and Seizure. *Columbia.*

Robert Fuquay; B.A., Florida, 1949; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. An Analysis of Florida Administrative Law and Procedure. *Florida.*

Ronald F. Howell; A.B., University of the South, 1948; M.A., Johns Hopkins, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Conservative Influence on Constitutional Development, 1922–1937; Justices Van Devanter, McReynolds, Sutherland, and Butler. *Johns Hopkins.*

George F. Moore; B.A., Southwest Missouri State, 1949; M.A., Iowa, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Governmental Reorganization in Iowa. *Iowa.*

Paul R. Murray; A.B., Idaho, 1941; A.M., Stanford, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Justice of the Peace in California. *Stanford.*

Pamela H. Rice; A.B., Antioch College, 1945; A.M., Chicago, 1947; Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1952. Racial Discrimination in Education under the United States Constitution. *Wisconsin.*

Jack W. Rodgers; A.B., Fort Hays Kansas State College, 1947; M.S., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., Nebraska, 1953. The United States Constitution and Religious Liberty. *Nebraska.*

Joseph Tanenhaus; A.B., Cornell, 1947; A.M., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Organized Labor and Freedom of Speech: A Study of the Law Governing Picketing and Labor's Political Spending. *Cornell.*

Clement E. Vose; A.B., Maine, 1947; A.M., Wisconsin, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Interest Groups before the Supreme Court: The Restrictive Covenant Cases of 1948. *Wisconsin.*

Ellis L. Waldron; A.B., Ohio State, 1936; A.M., Wisconsin, 1939; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Public Purpose Doctrine of Taxation. *Wisconsin.*

Sidney Wise; A.B., Harvard, 1946; Ph.D., California (Los Angeles), 1952. The Judicial Impact on Minimum-Wage Legislation. *California* (Los Angeles).

AMERICAN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Albert L. Alford; B.A., Akron, 1948; M.A., Princeton, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. FEPC: An Administrative Study of Selected State and Local Programs. *Princeton.*

Gordon E. Baker; B.A., Reed, 1948; M.A., Washington, 1949; M.A., Princeton, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. America's Rotten Boroughs: Urban Under-Representation in State Legislatures. *Princeton.*

Palayam M. C. Balasundaram; B.A., Allegheny, 1947; M.A., Boston University, 1948; Ph.D., The New School, 1952. The New York State Insurance Fund: A Case Study of Government in Business. *The New School.*

William H. Cape; A,B., Fort Hays Kansas State College, 1947; M.S., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., Kansas, 1952. The Kansas Department of Civil Service. *Kansas.*

Jeptha Carrell; A.B., Franklin and Marshall, 1944; M.A., Pennsylvania, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Inter-Jurisdictional Agreements in the Philadelphia Area. *Pennyslvania.*

J. M. Claunch; B.A., Stephen F. Austin College, 1928; M.Ed., Texas, 1937; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Government of Dallas County, Texas. *Texas.*

Morris W. H. Collins, Jr.; B.A., Georgia, 1939; M.A., *ibid.*, 1940; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. State Regulation of Discrimination in Employment. *Harvard.*

Richard W. Dodge; B.S., Yale, 1944; A.M., Columbia, 1949; Ph.D., Michigan, 1953. Some Aspects of the Political Behavior of Labor Union Members in the Detroit Metropolitan Area. *Michigan.*

Charles D. Farris; B.S., University of Florida, 1936; A.M., *ibid.*, 1941; Ph.D., Chicago, 1953. Politics in a Southern Urban Community. *Chicago.*

Charles D. Goff; A.B., Wisconsin, 1938; A.M., Northwestern, 1941; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. The Politics of Governmental Integration in Metropolitan Milwaukee. *Northwestern.*

Alex Gottfried; B.E., Chicago Teacher's College, 1941; A.M., Chicago, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. A. J. Cermak, Chicago Politician: A Study in Political Leadership. *Chicago.*

Robert O. McWilliams; A.B., Michigan, 1945; M.P.A., Wayne, 1947; Ph.D., Michigan, 1953. A Study of the Relationship of Political Behavior to Social Group Membership. *Michigan.*

Paul A. Pfretzschner; B.A., Buffalo, 1947; M.A., Yale, 1948; Ph.D., Iowa, 1953. City Planning and Reconstruction with Special Reference to the City of Easton, Pennsylvania. *Iowa.*

Victor G. Rosenblum; A.B., Columbia, 1945; LL.B., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., California (Berkeley), 1953. Milk Control in California: A Study in Constitutional Power. *California* (Berkeley).

Stephen B. Sarasohn; A.B., Wayne, 1945; A.M., Columbia, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Regulation of Parties and Nominations in Michigan: The Politics of Election Reform. *Columbia.*

John M. Selig; A.B., San Francisco, 1935; M.A., California (Berkeley), 1939; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Centralized State Tax Administration in California. *California* (Berkeley).

Robert G. Thompson; B.A., Highlands, 1948; M.A., New Mexico, 1949; Ph.D., Syracuse, 1953. Administrative Enforcement of Building Codes in Selected Cities and Counties. *Syracuse.*

Ellsworth E. Weaver; B.S., Utah, 1937; Sc.M., *ibid.*, 1938; Ph.D., New York University, 1953. The Evolution of Political Institutions in Utah. *New York University.*

John P. White; B.A., University of Cincinnati, 1949; A.M., Chicago, 1952; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Lithuanians and the Democratic Party: A Case Study of Nationality Politics in Cook County. *Chicago.*

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Charles P. Beall; A.B., DePauw, 1948; A.M., Indiana, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Pluralism in Administration: A Study of the Social Group in the Administrative Process. *Indiana.*

Ernest R. Bryan; A.B., Syracuse, 1929; A.M., George Washington, 1933; Ph.D., American, 1953. An Administrative History of the United States Naval Photographic Center, 1941–1951, with Recommendations for Reorganization. *American.*

Alan Campbell; A.B., Whitman, 1947; M.P.A., Wayne, 1949; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. The National Coal Board: The Relation of the Administrative Structure to the Problems Needing Solution. *Harvard.*

William N. Cassella, Jr.; A.B., Illinois, 1942; M.S., Syracuse, 1943; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. Governing the St. Louis Metropolitan Area: A Study in Public Administration. *Harvard.*

Joseph G. Colmen; B.S., City College, New York, 1939; M.A., Columbia, 1940; Ph.D., American, 1953. Objective Selection of Supervisory Personnel in Public Management. *American.*

Virginia Cook; A.B., Iowa, 1936; A.M., Illinois, 1941; Ph.D., Columbia, 1953. Administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act: An Experiment in Federal-State Cooperation. *Columbia.*

Robert T. Daland; A.B., Milton College, 1942; A.M., Wisconsin, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Public Health Administration in Alabama. *Wisconsin.*

Chester B. Earle; B.A., Texas, 1939: Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Some Policy and Administrative Aspects of a National Health Program. *Texas.*

Roy B, Eastin, Jr.; A.B., George Washington, 1945; M.A., *ibid.*, 1945; Ph.D., American, 1953. The Supervision Improvement Program of the Government Printing Office. *American.*

John Fletcher; A.B., Amherst, 1939; A.M., Chicago, 1940; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. The Federal Low-Rent Housing Program: A Study in Intergovernmental Relations. *Harvard.*

Reed L. Frischknecht; B.S., Utah State, 1947; M.S., Utah, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Administration of Agricultural Price Supports since World War II. *Utah.*

Hugh M. Hall, Jr.; B.A., Southern Methodist, 1943; Ph.D., Texas, 1953. The Investigatory Function of the Federal Trade Commission, 1933–1952. *Texas.*

Rolf N. B. Haugen; B.A., Minnesota, 1937; A.M., Harvard, 1943; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Setting of Internal Administrative Communication in the United States Naval Establishments, 1775–1920. *Harvard.*

John H. Kaufmann; A.B., Swarthmore, 1940; M.P.A., Harvard, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Estimation of Requirements for War: A Case Study in Steel. *Harvard.*

David MacEachron; A.B., Yale, 1944; M.P.A., Harvard, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Role of the United States Department of Labor. *Harvard.*

Robert J. M. Matteson; A.B., Middlebury College, 1938; M.P.A., Harvard, 1941; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Federal Forestry Administration. *Harvard.*

Charles A. Riegle; B.S., Ohio State, 1941; M.S., Syracuse, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Program Management in the Department of the Army. *Syracuse.*

Elliott P. Roberts; A.B., Reed College, 1939; Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1953. Relations between the Tennessee Valley Authority and State Governments in Control of the Tennessee River. *Wisconsin.*

Judson G. Rosebush; A.B., Lawrence, 1939; M.A., Fletcher School, 1940; Ph.D., Syracuse, 1953. A Scoring Schedule for the Measurement, Description and Analysis of Practices of Governmental Purchasing Agencies. *Syracuse.*

Yang-Ch'eng Shih; LL.B., National Tsing Hua University (China), 1939; M.A., Washington (Seattle), 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Theory and Practice of the Conservation of Water Resources in the United States, with Special Reference to Federal Administration. *Washington* (Seattle).

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Charles T. Baroch; Dr. Juris, Charles University Law School (Prague), 1945; M.A., Harvard, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Political and Social Institutions of the Russian Peasant, 1861–1905. *Harvard.*

Randolph Braham; M.S., C.C.N.Y., 1949; Ph.D., The New School, 1952. The People's Republic of Rumania: A Study of Its Genesis, Politics and Government. *The New School.*

Gerard Braunthal; A.B., Queens College, 1947; A.M., Michigan, 1948; Ph.D., Columbia, 1953. The Politics of the German Free

Trade Unions during the Weimar Period. *Columbia.*

MacAlister Brown; B.A., Wesleyan, 1947; A.M., Harvard, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Expulsion of German Minorities from Eastern Europe: The Decision at Potsdam and Its Background. *Harvard.*

Zbigniew K. Brzezinski; B.A., McGill, 1949; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. The Permanent Purge and Soviet Totalitarianism. *Harvard.*

Otto W. Butz; B.A., Toronto, 1947; M.A., Princeton, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Political Science and Society in Germany 1870–1933: An Introductory Survey. *Princeton.*

Elmer E. Cornwell, Jr.; B.A., Williams, 1948; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. Lloyd George: A Study in Political Leadership. *Harvard.*

Cornelius P. Cotter; B.A., Stanford, 1949; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. Constitutional Democracy and Emergency: Emergency Powers Legislation in Great Britain since 1914. *Harvard.*

Suna Kili Derya; A.B., Bryn Mawr, 1948; M.A., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Party Developments in Turkey: 1949–50. *Bryn Mawr.*

Donald B. Easum; A.B., Wisconsin, 1947; M.P.A., Princeton, 1950; M.A., *ibid.*, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The British-Argentine-United States Triangle: A Case Study in International Relations. *Princeton.*

Frank A. Ecker; A.B., Wisconsin, 1942; A.M., *ibid.*, 1947; Ph.D., Michigan, 1953. The Politics and Administration of Soviet Central Asia. *Michigan.*

Alexander Erlich; Ph.D., The New School, 1953. The Soviet Industrialization Controversy. *The New School.*

Henry C. Galant; B.A., Illinois, 1940; M.A., Harvard, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The French Social Security System: The Politics of Administration. *Harvard.*

E. Drexel Godfrey; A.B., Williams, 1946; M.A., Princeton, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. The Non-Communist Left in Post-War France. *Princeton.*

Umberto Gualtieri; B.B.A., Washington and Lee, 1929; D.S.Sc., The New School, 1943. Origin and Growth of the Italian Labor Movement (1860–1904). *The New School.*

William H. Harbold; A.B., Pennsylvania State, 1947; A.M., Harvard, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Monnet Plan: The French Experiment in National Economic Planning. *Harvard.*

Franklin W. Houn; A.B., National Chen-Chi University, 1946; A.M., Denver, 1950; Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1953. Central Government of China, 1911–1928: An Institutional Study. *Wisconsin.*

Walter H. Kaufmann; A.B., The New School, 1948; M.A., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1950. Monarchism in the Weimar Republic. *The New School.*

Francis P. King; B.S., Oregon, 1943; A.M., Stanford, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Third Force in French Politics. *Stanford.*

Tieh Tseng Li; LL.B., National Central University, Nanking, 1928; Ph.D., Columbia. 1953. Historical Study of the Statutes of Tibet. *Columbia.*

Bernard Lieb; A.B., Upsala, 1936; M.A., New York University, 1938; Ph.D., American, 1953. Government and Administration in the New India. *American.*

Yale C. Maxon; A.B., Stanford, 1928; M.A., Hawaii, 1933; Ph.D., California (Berkeley), 1953. Control of Japanese Foreign Policy, 1930–1945. *California* (Berkeley).

Joseph F. Menez; A.B., Notre Dame, 1945; A.M., *ibid.*, 1946; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. A Constitutional and Political Comparison of the Executive Office in Latin America and in the United States. *Notre Dame.*

Samuel M. Osgood; A.B., Nevada, 1949; A.M., Clark, 1951, Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Life and Politics of Henri, Comte de Paris. *Clark.*

Jaan Pennar; A.B., Bates, 1947; M.A., Princeton, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Richard Coblen and Cordell Hull: A Contemporary Study of the Commercial Policies of 19th Century England and Contemporary United States. *Princeton.*

Louise N. Powelson; A.B., Wellesley, 1944; A.M., Yale, 1946: Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Political Parties of Austria, 1945–1951. *Yale.*

Izzideen Rawi; Licencié, Teachers College, Bagdad, 1939; M.A., Indiana, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. The Policy of the Arab States towards Palestine. *Indiana.*

Arnold A. Rogow; A.B., Wisconsin, 1947; M.A., Princeton, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. The Labor Government and British Industry, 1945–1951. *Princeton.*

Mario Rossi; Ph.D., The New School, 1952. The Jews in Modern Italy (1795–1945). *The New School.*

Janet S. Seigel; A.B., New York University, 1942; A.M., *ibid.*, 1943; Ph.D., The New School, 1948. An Introduction to the Study of the Constitution of the Fourth French Republic. *The New School.*

John B. Stewart; A.B., Wolfville (N.S.,) 1945; A.M., *ibid.*, 1946; Ph.D., Columbia, 1953. Parliament and Executive in Wartime Canada, 1939–1945. *Columbia.*

Arthur R. Swearingen; A.B., Southern California, 1947; A.M., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. The Japanese Communist Party and the Comintern, 1919–1943. *Harvard.*

Max B. Thatcher; B.S., California (Los Angeles), 1935; A.M., *ibid.*, 1936: Ph.D., Northwestern, 1953. The Political Island of Quebec: A Study in Federalism. *Northwestern.*

Te Hua Wang; B.A., Catholic University, Peiping, 1945; M.A., Denver, 1949; Ph.D., Iowa, 1952. Land Reform in the People's Republic of China. *Iowa.*

Ruth C. Widmayer; B.A., Washington (Seattle), 1943; M.A., *ibid.*, 1946; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. The Communist Party and the Soviet Schools, 1917–1937. *Harvard.*

Paul E. Zinner; B.S., Tufts, 1943; A.M., Harvard, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Strategy and Tactics of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, 1945–1952. *Harvard.*

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, POLITICS AND LAW

Dion J. J. Archon; A.B., Harvard, 1940; A.M., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The United States and the Eastern Mediterranean. *Harvard.*

Mohsen D. Beheshti; A.B., University of Teheran, 1944; M.A., Columbia, 1947; Ph.D., The New School, 1951. Iran's Foreign Policy and Relations since 1940: A Study of the Forces that Affected Iran's Modern History. *The New School.*

Michael Brecher; A.B., McGill, 1946; A.M., Yale, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Kashmir Impasse. *Yale.*

Holbert N. Carroll; A.B., Pittsburgh, 1943; M.A., *ibid.*, 1947; Ph.D., Harvard, 1953. The House of Representatives and Foreign Affairs. *Harvard.*

David T. Cattell; A.B., Amherst, 1947; A.M., Columbia, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Soviet Policy and the Spanish Civil War, 1936–1939. *Columbia.*

Paul T. Chang; A.B., St. John's University, Shanghai, 1946; Ph.D., Notre Dame, 1953. Political Effects of World War II on Korea, with Special Reference to the Policies of the United States. *Notre Dame.*

James S. Coleman; A.B., Brigham Young, 1947; M.A., Harvard, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Nationalism in Nigeria. *Harvard.*

Arthur C. Cressy, Jr.; A.B., Tufts, 1944; A.M., Fletcher School, 1945; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Canadian-American Co-operation in World War II. *Fletcher School.*

Robert B. Farrell; B.A., Queen's University, 1947; A.M., Harvard, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Planning and Control of Canadian Foreign Policy. *Harvard.*

Richard A. Fuller; A.B., Coe College, 1944; M.S., Wisconsin, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Case Studies in Bipartisanship in United States Postwar Foreign Policy. *Wisconsin.*

John B. Furey; A.B., Southern California, 1947; A.M., Columbia, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Voting Alignment in the General Assembly. *Columbia.*

Franklin S. Gonzalez; A.B., California (Los Angeles), 1947; M.A., *ibid.*, 1948; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Mexico and the United Nations. *California* (Los Angeles).

Morton Gordon; B.A., St. John's University, 1948; A.M., Chicago, 1950; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. American Opposition to the E.R.P. and the North Atlantic Treaty—A Study of Anti-Administration Opinion. *Chicago.*

Anni A. Gottschalk; M.S.Sc., The New School, 1945; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Legal Studies on Collective Security under the League of Nations Covenant and United Nations Charter. *The New School.*

Wallace B. Graves; B.A., Oklahoma, 1943; M.A., Texas Christian, 1947; Ph.D., Texas, 1953. The United Nations, Great Britain and the British Non-Self Governing Territories. *Texas.*

Frank J. Heintz, Jr.; A.B., Catholic, 1947; M.A., *ibid.*, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Regionalism in Political International Organization. *Catholic.*

Gilbert O. Hourtoule, Jr.; B.A., New Jersey State Teachers College, 1947; M.A., Stanford, 1948; Ph.D., Pennsylvania State, 1953. The Case of Franco Spain before the United Nations, 1946–50. *Pennsylvania State.*

R. Chu-Kua Huang; A.B., National Central University, Nanking, 1941; Ph.D., Kentucky, 1953. Toward European Union. *Kentucky.*

Fred. J. Khouri; B.S., Columbia, 1938; A.M., *ibid.*, 1939; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Arab States and the United Nations. *Columbia.*

S. P. Kuo; A.B., National Tsing Hua University, 1933; A.M., Columbia, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Chinese Reaction to Foreign Encroachment, with Special Reference to the First Sino-Japanese War and Its Immediate Aftermath. *Columbia.*

Augusta E. Lansing; A.M., Fordham, 1941; Ph.D., Chicago, 1951. Czechoslovakia's Foreign Policy, 1939–45: A Study in Futility. *Chicago.*

James N. Murray, Jr.; A.B., Illinois, 1947; A.M., Fletcher School, 1948; Ph.D., Illinois, 1953. The Formation and Functioning of the Trusteeship System of the United Nations. *Illinois.*

William C. Olson; A.B., Denver, 1942; A.M., Yale, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Theodore Roosevelt and American Participation in a League of Nations. *Yale.*

Alexander G. Park; A.B., Iowa, 1946; A.M., *ibid.*, 1947; Ph.D., Columbia. 1953. Soviet Nationality Policy, 1917–1927: A Study of Bolshevik Doctrine and Practice, with Special Reference to Central Asia. *Columbia.*

Henry A. Peck; A.B., Tufts, 1942; A.M., Fletcher School, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Freedom, Planning and International Trade. *Fletcher School.*

Paul Seabury; A.B., Swarthmore, 1946; Ph.D., Columbia, 1953. The Wilhelmstrasse: A Study of German Diplomats under the Nazi Regime. *Columbia.*

John R. Skretting; B.A., Beloit, 1947; M.A., Iowa, 1949; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Republican Attitudes toward the Administration's China Policy, 1945–1949. *Iowa.*

Fred A. Sondermann; A.B., Butler, 1949; A.M., Indiana, 1950; Ph.D., Yale, 1953. The Wilson Administration's Image of Germany. *Yale.*

Suk-Soon Suh; A.B., Seoul National University, 1947; M.A., Nebraska, 1951; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. Recent Constitutions in Relation to International Law. *Nebraska.*

Peter S. H. Tang; A.M., Columbia, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1952. Russian and Soviet Policy in Manchuria and Outer Mongolia, 1911–1931. *Columbia.*

John S. Thomson; A.B., Swarthmore, 1943; A.M., Columbia, 1947; Ph.D., *ibid.*, 1953. The Government of the Shanghai International Settlement. *Columbia.*

Lenoir C. Wright; A.B., North Carolina, 1933; A.B., Oxford, 1935; A.M., *ibid.*, 1942; LL.B., Harvard, 1938; Ph.D., Columbia, 1953. United States Policy toward Egypt, 1830–1914. *Columbia.*

BOOK REVIEWS, NOTES, AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ARTICLES 844

Publications on Australia Useful to a Political Scientist: A Selective Survey. LOUISE OVERACKER 844

REVIEWS OF BOOKS 858

Howe, Holmes-Laski Letters: The Correspondence of Mr. Justice Holmes and Harold J. Laski, 1916–1935. GEORGE CATLIN 858
Easton, The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science. WILLIAM ANDERSON 862
Himmelfarb, Lord Acton: A Study in Conscience and Politics; *Fasnacht*, Acton's Political Philosophy: An Analysis; *Acton*, Essays on Church and State. C. H. DRIVER 865
Kirk, The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana. CLINTON ROSSITER 868
Elliott, United States Foreign Policy: Its Organization and Control. JAMES L. McCAMY 870
Webb, The Great Frontier. DAVID M. POTTER 871
Strausz-Hupé, The Zone of Indifference. FREDERICK M. WATKINS 874
Kahin, Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia. AMRY VANDENBOSCH 877
Kruse, The Community of the Future. EDGAR BODENHEIMER 879
Swenson, Federal Administrative Law. K. C. COLE 880
Carr, The House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1945–1950. ROBERT A. HORN 882
Nature and Needs of Higher Education: The Report of the Commission on Financing Higher Education [together with staff studies]. GEORGE C. S. BENSON 883

BOOK NOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY 891

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS 891
FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT 900
INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS 909
POLITICAL THEORY, RESEARCH, AND METHODOLOGY 920

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ARTICLES

PUBLICATIONS ON AUSTRALIA USEFUL TO THE POLITICAL SCIENTIST: A SELECTIVE SURVEY*

As a relatively young democracy in which parliamentary government is combined with federalism and judicial review, Australia offers a particularly rich and challenging field of study to political scientists. Yet only recently have scholars at home or abroad shown much interest in its political institutions, and political science in a formal disciplinary sense is just beginning to be recognized by Australian universities.

The establishment of departments or chairs of political science at several of the state universities, and the recognition of the field in the Social Science Division of the Australian National University at Canberra, are encouraging signs of an awareness of the importance of political science as an academic discipline. At the same time an increasing number of scholars are turning their attention to problems of Australian politics and government, and an invaluable collection of basic materials is being assembled by the Commonwealth National Library. For many periods there continues to be a lack of the basic historical studies necessary for a definitive interpretation of men and events, and until more of these gaps are filled in it is unlikely that Australia will find "its Dicey, its Bagehot, its Jennings, its Bryce, and even its Brogan." In the meantime significant studies more limited in scope can be, and are being, made.

A sign of maturity is the movement currently under way to form a professional organization of political scientists. Already in existence is the Australian Institute of Political Science, which since 1932 has encouraged an interest in political, economic, and social problems among laymen and academicians. Its "summer schools" and "winter forums" generate many lively discussions and some of the papers read at the sessions (published by the Institute) are a valuable addition to the literature of the field.

The purpose of this article is to stimulate an interest in Australia among political scientists by pointing out the wealth of raw data waiting to be explored, as well as to guide readers to the more significant studies already published. The works listed fall into four groups: first, basic materials and "tools" such as handbooks, government documents, bibliographies, journals, newspapers, manuscript collections, and party publications; second, books contributing to an understanding of Australia and Australians; third, histories and biographies; and, finally, studies falling directly within the fields of political science and public law.

---

* Much of the material for this article was collected in Australia in 1946–1947 and 1951. The writer is indebted to the Social Science Research Council, the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation, and Wellesley College for the assistance which made these visits possible. In checking recent publications she had many helpful suggestions from C. Hartley Grattan, which are gratefully acknowledged.

I

Commonwealth of Australia, Bureau of the Census, *Official Year Book* (Government Printer, Canberra), published by the Commonwealth in 1908 and biennially thereafter, includes valuable data. The electoral data included are very limited, however. Yearbooks or handbooks are also available for each of the states. Indispensable to the student of parties and politics is W. F. Whyte, *The Australian Parliamentary Handbook* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1952), inaugurating a new series. Included are the names of the officers of the Commonwealth and the respective states, 1951 election figures, and information about party organizations and leaders. Percival Serle, *Dictionary of Australian Biography* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1949, 2 vols.), includes short biographies of more than 1,000 Australians and others closely connected with Australia, who died before 1942. Designed primarily for settlers and tourists, but including information useful to the scholar, is the Australian National Publicity Association's *Australia: Official Handbook* (Melbourne), published by the Association in 1941, and periodically thereafter. A handsomely bound and illustrated volume containing up-to-date information about present-day institutions is Oswald L. Ziegler (ed.), *Official Commemorative Book, Jubilee of the Commonwealth of Australia* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1950), which was prepared by authority of the Commonwealth government and in collaboration with the Australian News and Information Bureau, Department of Interior. Indispensable to those in the United States who wish to keep abreast of current developments in Australia are daily mimeographed digests of news compiled from short-wave radio dispatches and other sources by the Commonwealth News and Information Bureau, New York. By paying mailing costs, these may be obtained from the Bureau, 636 Fifth Avenue, New York 20.

The research scholar will find rich primary source material in the documents of the Commonwealth and state governments. *Historical Records of Australia* (Government Printer, 1914 to date) are still being published.

The movement culminating in the drafting of the Commonwealth Constitution is covered in Australasian Federation Conference, 1890, *Proceedings and Debates* (Government Printer, Melbourne, 1890), and National Australasian Convention, 1891, *Official Report of the Convention Debates, 1897–1898* (Adelaide, 1897; Sydney, 1897; Melbourne, 1898).

Available in convenient pamphlet form, splendidly annotated and indexed, and revised periodically, is the Commonwealth of Australia, *Constitution* (Government Printer, Canberra). Commonwealth statutes are compiled in *Acts of the Commonwealth of Australia,* in force on January 1, 1936 (Government Printer, Canberra 4 vols.), and *Consolidation of Commonwealth Acts, 1901–1935* (Government Printer, Canberra). Supplements to these documents are published from time to time. Complete statutory consolidations are also available for all states except Western Australia. Equally important are the Commonwealth of Australia *Parliamentary Debates*, Senate and House, 1901 to present. Colonial and state parliamentary debates are published by all states except Tasmania.

Valuable material on the functioning of the federal system is included in Commonwealth of Australia, Royal Commission on the Constitution, *Report together with Appendixes and Index* (Government Printer, Canberra, 1929), and Convention of Representatives of the Commonwealth and State Parliaments on Proposed Alteration of the Commonwealth Constitution, November 24-December 2, 1942, *Record of Proceedings* (Canberra, 1942).

Commonwealth of Australia, Chief Electoral Officer, *Statistical Returns* (Government Printer, Canberra), published after each Commonwealth election, contain the raw data for significant studies of voting behavior.

The decisions of the High Court of Justice have been published in the *Commonwealth Law Reports* since 1903. The *Australian Digest, 1825–1933* (1940, 24 vols.), plus supplements, includes decisions of state and Commonwealth courts. Also available is a *Legal Monthly Digest.*

Select Documents in Australian History, 1788–1850 (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1950) is the first of a two-volume set by Charles M. H. Clark, Professor of History at Canberra University College. Arranged topically, and designed primarily for use in schools and universities, it includes many documents, but the extracts are often extremely short.

Comprehensive bibliographical guides are available only for the earlier period. *Bibliography of Captain Cook, R.N.* (Sydney, 1928) covers the collections in the Mitchell Library of New South Wales and in the Commonwealth National Library. John A. Ferguson's monumental *Bibliography of Australia* has been carried down to 1845 in the following volumes: Vol. 1, 1787–1830; Vol. II, 1831–1838; Vol. III, 1839–1845 (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1941, 1945, and 1951). Only highly selective lists are available to students working in later periods. Among these the following may be mentioned: Commonwealth of Australia, *Official Year Book; Cambridge History of the British Empire,* Vol. VII, Part I (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1933); R. M. Crawford, *Australia* (Hutchinson's University Library: British Empire History, 1952); L. F. Crisp, *The Parliamentary Government of the Commonwealth of Australia* (Longman's in association with the Wakefield Press, Adelaide, 1949; Yale University Press, New Haven, 1949); C. Hartley Grattan (ed.), *Australia* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1947); U. S. Library of Congress, Division of Bibliography, *A Selected List of References on Australia* (Washington, 1942). Students visiting Australia are advised to avail themselves of the resources of the Mitchell wing of the New South Wales Library, Sydney, and the Commonwealth National Library, Canberra, where intelligent, cooperative staffs and rich resources are available. The Commonwealth National Library began its *Annual Catalogue of Australian Publications* with the year 1936 (Canberra, 1937) and its Public Affairs Information Service launched a monthly *Subject List to Current Literature* in July, 1945.

Invaluable for an understanding of the manners, morals, and politics of Australia in the 1880's and '90's is the *Bulletin,* published weekly in Sydney from 1880 on. This great independent journal of opinion crusaded for republicanism, a democratic franchise, and a united Australia. It was bitterly opposed to sectarianism in politics, hypocrisy in social life, and Chinese immigration. The *Sydney Morning Herald*, published for over a hundred years and popularly known as "Old Granny Herald," is still the leading newspaper of Australia's largest city. It is strongly antilabor in slant, but its news coverage is good and it carries excellent special articles.

Rich material on both the early trade union movement and the organization of the Labor party is to be found in labor journals. The *Worker* (Queensland) was launched in Brisbane in 1890 and until 1892 was edited by the brilliant William Lane, who crusaded for socialism and the "new unionism." Started independently somewhat later was the *Worker* (Sydney), later rechristened the *Australian Worker*, which became the official organ of the powerful Australian Workers' Union. Among the more interesting present-day journals are *Common Cause*, official mouthpiece of the militant Miners' Federation of Australia; *Railroad*, the organ of the Australian Railway's Union; and the *Westralian Worker*, official newspaper of the Australian Workers' Union in Western Australia. Party organs include the weekly *Standard*, published by the New South Wales Labor party from 1943 to 1951, and the *Tribune* (Sydney), the official newspaper of the Australian Communist party. Unlike Britain, Australia has no Labor daily.

The scholarly and professional journals published in Australia are limited in number but include material of great value. The *Australian Law Journal*, published monthly since 1927 (Law Book Co., Sydney), is the organ of the legal profession. The *Australian Outlook*, launched in 1947 by the Australian Institute of International Affairs, includes excellent articles on a wide variety of topics. The most valuable periodical of general circulation is the *Australian Quarterly*, published by the Australian Institute of Political Science, Sydney, since 1929. It has recently added a department entitled "Political Review," by Goeffrey Sawer, Professor of Law at the National University, which is of special value to Americans endeavoring to keep abreast of developments in Australia. *Economic Record*, published since 1925 as the journal of the Economic Society of Australia and New Zealand, includes studies on a wide range of topics. Articles of high quality appear in *Historical Studies; Australia and New Zealand*, published twice yearly since 1941 under the auspices of the University of Melbourne. Among its regular features are lists of theses under way in Australasian universities, and accessions of manuscripts. *Public Administration*, published since 1937 as the journal of the Australian regional groups of the Institute of Public Administration, includes excellent articles and book reviews. One of the more recent additions to the professional journals is *Social Horizons*, launched in 1945 by the Australian Institute of Sociology. The *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, now in its thirty-ninth year, includes many excellent papers. Articles on Australia in *Round Table* (London) are less good than those for some other areas but, nevertheless, are a useful guide to current developments.

The student of politics will find rich material in the publications of the various political parties. For the Australian Labor party, complete records are available of the proceedings of interstate conferences and of the annual meetings of the New South Wales party. Handbooks, including the constitution and rules of the party, are published for all states. *Forming the Liberal Party of Australia* is a useful record of the conferences leading to the organization of the present-day Liberal party. Current basic documents are published periodically by the federal secretariat of the party in a pamphlet entitled *Liberal Platform and Federal Constitution.* Also available are the constitutions and platforms of the state divisions of the Liberal party. Publications of the Country party include the platforms and policy statements of the federal party, and constitutions and rules of state organizations in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, and Western Australia. In South Australia, the Country party is served by the Liberal and Country League. The New South Wales party publishes the *Countryman,* a journal which has a wide circulation in rural areas. The Communist party publishes its constitution, its conference proceedings, and a wide variety of campaign literature. The *Communist Review,* a monthly organ of "theory and practice of the Australian Communist Party," began publication in 1941.

II

For those unfamiliar with Australia's heritage, environment, and character probably the best introduction is C. Hartley Grattan, *Introducing Australia* (first published 1942; rev. ed., John Day, N. Y., 1947). A useful symposium is the volume on *Australia* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1947), edited by Grattan, which appeared in the United Nations Series. Two brief but excellent interpretive studies by distinguished historians are: W. K. Hancock, *Australia* (Ernest Benn, London, 1930; Scribner's Sons, N. Y., 1931), and R. M. Crawford, *Australia* (Hutchinson's University Library: British Empire History, 1952). A study somewhat confusingly organized but including valuable material is Brian C. Fitzpatrick, *The Australian People, 1788–1945* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 2nd ed., 1951).

A book which will make the reader feel the sand and heat of the "outback" and appreciate the fortitude and integrity of those who live there, is Francis Ratcliffe, *Flying Fox and Drifting Sands* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1947). The author is an English scientist now permanently attached to the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research at Canberra.

G. V. Portus, *Free, Compulsory and Secular; A Critical Estimate of Australian Education* (Oxford University Press, London, 1937), is an excellent introduction to some of the geographical and historical factors which help to explain Australia's centralized system of education. The volume brings together three Joseph Payne lectures which this distinguished Australian historian gave under the auspices of the British Institute of Education.

Although Mollie Bayne, *The Australian Community* (Longman's, London, rev. ed., 1951), was written for school children, adults will find it a good introduction to the economy and government of Australia. *Freedom and Planning in Australia* (Univ. of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1949), by A. Campbell

Garnett, an Australian now teaching philosophy in an American university, is a useful elementary study of the social and economic system. In the concluding chapters the objectives of each political party are summarized by a representative of the group.

Those in search of solid fare will find several excellent studies of Australia's physiography and resources. Griffith Taylor, *Australia: A Study of Warm Environments and Their Effect on British Settlement* (Dutton, New York, 1940), and S. M. Wadham and G. L. Wood, *Land Utilization in Australia* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1950), are among the best. A useful symposium is G. L. Wood (ed.), *Australia: Its Resources and Development* (Macmillan, New York, 1947). An excellent short introduction is *The Australian Environment* (Melbourne, 1949), prepared for the British Commonwealth Agricultural Conference held in Australia in August, 1949, by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization.

Some of Australia's ablest scholars have directed their attention to the development and functioning of the economy, and some notable studies are available in this field. Edward O. G. Shann, *An Economic History of Australia* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1930), is slanted in defense of private enterprise. Two standard volumes which will serve as an effective antidote are Brian Fitzpatrick, *British Imperialism and Australia, 1783–1833: An Economic History of Australia* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1939), and *The British Empire in Australia: An Economic History, 1834–1931* (Melbourne University Press, 1937). J. A. Nauze, *Political Economy in Australia; Historical Studies* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1949), is another useful work. A brief treatment designed primarily for use in schools is A. G. L. Shaw, *The Economic Development of Australia* (Longman's, London, rev. ed., 1946).

Among recent studies of special phases of the economy, political scientists will find the following particularly useful: Colin Clark, *The National Income of Australia* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1938); Sir Douglas B. Copland, *The Australian Economy* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 4th ed., 1941), and *Australia in the World Crisis, 1929–1943* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1934); Orwell de R. Foenander, *Industrial Regulations in Australia* (Melbourne University, Melbourne, 1947), and *Studies in Australian Labour Law and Relations* (Melbourne University, Melbourne, 1952); L. F. Giblin, *The Growth of a Central Bank* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1951); Lloyd Ross, *Labor in Australia* (American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1943); E. Ronald Walker, *The Australian Economy in War and Reconstruction* (Oxford University Press, London, 1947).

Two works which might be termed "classics" are Albert Métin, *Le Socialisme, sans doctrines* (Félix Alcan, Paris, 1901; 2nd ed., 1910), a widely quoted study of the early socialist movements in Australia and New Zealand; and William Pember Reeves, *State Experiments in Australia and New Zealand* (G. Richards, London, 1902; Dutton, N. Y., 1925), by a statesman who played an important role in New Zealand politics.

Henry Bourne Higgins, *A New Province for Law and Order* (Workers' Education Association, Sydney, 1922), is a notable essay on compulsory arbitration by a distinguished president of the arbitration court who helped shape the policies of that body.

III

In the field of history and biography, important gaps remain to be filled in, but the excellence of much of the work already done encourages one to look optimistically to the future.

Although now out-of-date, the *Cambridge History of the British Empire: Australia* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1933, Vol. VII, Part I), includes indispensable material. Among the articles particularly useful for an understanding of present-day issues are the following: F. Alexander, "Australia Since the War"; K. H. Bailey, "Self-Government in Australia, 1860–1900"; Sir Robert Garran, "The Federation Movement and the Founding of the Commonwealth"; W. K. Hancock, "The Commonwealth, 1900–1914"; A. C. V. Melbourne, "The Establishment of Responsible Government"; Sir W. Harrison Moore, "The Constitution and Its Working"; Sir Ernest Scott, "Australia in the World War: Political"; E. O. G. Shann, "Economic and Political Development." *The Official History of Australia in the War of 1914–1918,* edited by C. E. W. Bean, is available in twelve volumes (Sydney, 1921–1942).

For excellent brief, readable treatments of essentials by distinguished historians the beginner is referred to Sir Ernest Scott, *A Short History of Australia* (Oxford University Press, 7th ed., rev. by Herbert Burton, 1947), and F. L. W. Wood, *A Concise History of Australia* (Dymock Book Arcade, Sydney, 1935). Arthur N. Smith, *Thirty Years: The Commonwealth of Australia, 1901–1931* (Brown Prior & Co., Melbourne, 1933), is a useful political history written by a journalist.

For many periods and aspects of Australian history definitive studies from primary sources are still lacking, but examples of meticulous scholarship may be cited. Eris M. O'Brien, *The Foundation of Australia, 1786–1800* (Sheed & Ward, London, 1937; Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 2nd ed., 1950), on the period of penal colonization, ranks high on the list. Other excellent studies of colonization are R. B. Madgwick, *Immigration into Eastern Australia, 1788–1851* (Longman's, London, 1937), and R. C. Mills, *The Colonization of Australia, 1829–42* (Sidgwick & Jackson, London, 1915). H. V. Evatt, *Rum Rebellion: A Study of the Overthrow of General Bligh* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1938), is a study of a crisis in early New South Wales history which is of special interest to students of politics. The author, who in the course of his distinguished career has been a member of the High Court of Justice and played a prominent part in United Nations proceedings, is now leader of the Australian Labor party.

The standard works on the pastoral period are two volumes by Stephen H. Roberts, *History of Australian Land Settlement* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1924), and *The Squatting Age in Australia, 1835–1847* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1935).

Relatively little work has been done on the history of the respective states.

A. C. V. Melbourne, *Early Constitutional Development in Australia: New South Wales, 1788–1856* (Oxford University Press, London, 1934), is among the notable exceptions. Two other studies which merit mention are J. S. Battye, *History of Western Australia* (Oxford University Press, London, 1924), and A. Grenville Price, *The Foundation and Settlement of South Australia, 1835–47* (Melbourne University, Melbourne, 1935). W. A. Townsley, *The Struggle for Self-Government in Tasmania, 1842–1856* (Government Printer, Hobart, 1951), is a recent pioneering study of a colony in which resistance to the transportation of convicts was involved in the struggle for self-government.

F. Alexander, *Moving Frontiers, an American Theme and its Application to Australian History* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1947), is an interesting plea for a reexamination of Australian history in the light of the Turner thesis.

Although several short histories of the labor movement have been written, no definitive work is yet available on this controversial and important topic. A useful work on the early period is James T. Sutcliffe, *A History of Trade Unionism in Australia* (Macmillan, Melbourne and London, 1921). This appeared originally in the Workers' Education Series. Probably the best brief survey is Brian C. Fitzpatrick, *A Short History of the Australian Labor Movement* (Rawson's Bookshop, Melbourne, new enlarged ed., 1944), by a distinguished economic historian at one time identified with the militant wing of the Australian Labor party. Frankly Communist in its slant is E. W. Campbell, *History of the Australian Labor Movement: A Marxist Interpretation* (Current Book Distributors, Sydney, 1945).

When one turns to biography one finds a few notable works, some superficial studies, and many gaps. Biographies which shed much light upon the early history and politics of two colonies are M. H. Ellis, *Lachlan Macquarie: His Life, Adventures and Times* (Dymock Book Arcade, Sydney, 1947), and Kathleen Fitzpatrick, *Sir John Franklin in Tasmania, 1837–1843* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1949).

Men prominent in the federation movement are the focus of two good biographies: Walter L. F. Murdoch, *Alfred Deakin: A Sketch* (Constable, London and Sydney, 1923); and John Reynolds, *Edmund Barton* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1948). Deakin's own disappointing account of this important period will be found in Alfred Deakin, *The Federal Story; The Inner History of the Federal Cause* (Robertson & Mullens, Melbourne, 1944).

Indispensable to students interested in the Labor party are H. V. Evatt, *Australian Labour Leader: The Story of W. A. Holman and the Labour Movement* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 3d ed., 1945), and Lloyd Ross, *William Lane and the Australian Labor Movement* (Forward Press, Sydney, 1938). The former is a history and an interpretation of the politics of New South Wales and the Commonwealth, as well as a biography of one of Australia's great political leaders; the latter is the story of a brilliant journalist who was identified with the socialist wing of the Queensland labor movement and who organized the ill-fated "New Australia" expedition to South America. An excellent brief sketch of an early labor leader is Clive Turnbull, *Bluestone: The Story of James Stephens, Leader of the Early Eight Hours Movement* (Hawthorn Press, Melbourne, 1945).

William G. Spence, one of the founders of the Australian Workers' Union and the Labor party, has written his account of these early struggles in *Australia's Awakening: Thirty Years in the Life of an Australian Agitator* (The Worker, Brisbane, 1942). First published in 1909, it includes material not readily available elsewhere.

Nettie Palmer, *Henry Bourne Higgins* (G. G. Harrup, 1931), is a notable biography of a distinguished "charter" member of the Commonwealth Court of Arbitration and Conciliation.

An excellent analysis of federal politics, as well as a keen interpretation of the career of a Liberal statesman who was active during the first thirty years of the Commonwealth, is L. F. Fitzhardinge, "Political and Public Life of Sir Littleton Ernest Groom," in *Nation Building in Australia; The Life and Work of Sir Littleton Ernest Groom* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1941).

In the absence of full-length studies, mention should be made of the excellent short sketches in Vance Palmer, *National Portraits* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1940).

William Morris Hughes, the statesman whose public activity spanned sixty years and two world wars, and who at different times led both the Labor and Nationalist parties, wrote two volumes of memoirs: *Crusts and Crusades: Tales of Bygone Days* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1947); and *Policies and Potentates* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1950). Although something of the flavor of the man may be gained from these reminiscences, neither they nor a popular biography, Frank C. Browne, *They Called Him Billy: A Biography of the Rt. Hon. W. M. Hughes* (Peter Huston, Sydney, 1946), are safe guides to his place in history. Fortunately, the task of writing a full-scale biography of Hughes has been undertaken by L. F. Fitzhardinge, Reader in Sources of Australian History at the National University, who is admirably equipped for the task.[1] One may safely anticipate that the completed work will be a major contribution to the literature of the field.

Another important work which will be awaited eagerly is a biography of J. B. Chifley, the late leader of the Labor party, by L. F. Crisp, Professor of Political Science, Canberra University College.

IV

Turning to those studies falling directly in the fields of political science and public law, one may begin with works on the Commonwealth Constitution. Two which were for years the standard books on the making and early development of the Constitution are John Quick and Robert R. Garran, *The Annotated*

---

[1] Mr. Fitzhardinge is the author of "W. M. Hughes in New South Wales Politics, 1890–1900," *Journal and Proceedings of the Royal Australian Historical Society*, Vol. 37, Part III (December, 1951), as well as of the Groom biography cited above.

Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1901), and W. Harrison Moore, *The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia* (Sweet and Maxwell, Melbourne and London, 2nd ed., 1910). A useful and important recent addition in the field by a distinguished jurist is H. S. Nicholas, *The Australian Constitution* (Law Book Co., of Australia, Sydney, 1948). The volume includes helpful analytical notes, the texts of many important acts and agreements, and the text of the Constitution. A pioneer volume in a field hitherto largely neglected is George W. Paton (ed.), *The Commonwealth of Australia: the Development of Its Laws and Constitution* (Stevens, London, 1952), which is the second volume in a series on the development of the laws and constitutions of the British Commonwealth. The following chapters are especially usefully to the political scientist: "Constitutional Law," by Geoffrey Sawer; "Law and Legal Institutions Affecting the Rural Economy," by S. M. Wadham; and "Social Services," by T. Kewley. A useful collection of leading cases with helpful explanatory and critical notes will be found in Geoffrey Sawer, *Cases on the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia* (Law Book Co. of Australia, Sydney, 1948).

A standard work on an interesting constitutional problem is H. V. Evatt, *The King and His Dominion Governors: A Study of the Reserve Powers of the Crown in Great Britain and the Dominions* (Oxford University Press, London, 1936). W. A. Holman, *The Australian Constitution: Its Interpretation and Amendment* (Law Book Co. of Australia, Sydney, 1928), reflects the ideas of one of labor's early leaders.

The problem of striking a satisfactory balance between federal and state powers, which has never been happily solved in Australia, has claimed the attention of British and American, as well as of Australian, scholars. Australia is included in the general study by K. C. Wheare, *Federal Government* (Oxford University Press, London, 1947). The views of a distinguished group of scholars who participated in two seminars arranged as part of Australia's Jubilee celebration are brought together in Geoffrey Sawer (ed.), *Federalism: An Australian Jubilee Study* (published for the Australian National University by F. W. Cheshire, Melbourne, 1952).

Federalism was the earliest Australian problem to elicit the interest of American political scientists and two useful studies have resulted: E. M. Hunt, *American Precedents in Australian Federation* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1930); and K. O. Warner, *An Introduction to Some Problems of Australian Federation* (University of Washington Press, Seattle, 1933). A more recent study by an Australian scholar who is skeptical of the value of federalism is Gordon Greenwood, *The Future of Australian Federalism: A Commentary on the Working of the Constitution* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1946). D. H. Drummond, *Australia's Changing Constitution; No States or New States* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 2nd ed., 1946), is a defense of federalism and an appeal for new states by one of the leaders of the Country party. Many of the forums of the Australian Institute of Political Science have been concerned with problems of federalism and papers delivered at these sessions, most of which are available in published form, are valuable contributions to the literature of the field.

Until recently no comprehensive study of Australian government, Commonwealth or state, was available, and the subject was not recognized in university programs. About a hundred pages were devoted to Australia in Viscount Bryce's *Modern Democracies* (Macmillan, New York, 1921), and certain aspects of its government were covered in A. B. Keith, *Responsible Government in the Dominions* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2nd ed., 1928). More recently Australia was included in *Democracy in the Dominions* (University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 2nd ed., 1952), a first-rate comparative study by the Canadian scholar, Alexander Brady. A reassuring sign of interest in this neglected field is the appearance of two recent general studies by Australians. The first full-length study of the democratic parliamentary institutions of the Commonwealth appeared on the eve of its fiftieth anniversary: L. F. Crisp, *The Parliamentary Government of the Commonwealth of Australia* (Longman's Green, Melbourne and London, in association with the Wakefield Press, Adelaide, 1949; Yale University Press, New Haven, 1949), is a work of permanent value by the Professor of Political Science at Canberra University College. An indispensable supplement to Crisp's book is Geoffrey Sawer, *Australian Government Today* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1948; 2nd ed., 1952), which gives an admirable, brief, and lucid description of the salient features of the governments of the states as well as of the Commonwealth. An introductory treatment more limited in scope is Thomas P. Fry, *Australian Contributions to the Evolution of Parliamentary Government* (University of Queensland Papers, Faculty of Law, Vol. I, No. 1, 1947).

Two books designed primarily for the layman will be useful to the specialist. John E. Edwards, *Parliament and How It Works* (Canberra, 1945), is a description of the organization and procedure of the Commonwealth Parliament by the Clerk of the Senate. The second is a sympathetic treatment by a journalist with long experience at Canberra: Warren Denning, *Inside Parliament* (Australasian Publishing Co., Sydney, 1946). A useful pamphlet, written by a divisional returning officer for Commonwealth elections, is E. P. Senior, *Australian Systems of Voting* (Current Book Distributors, Sydney, 1946).

To F. A. Bland, the first professor of public administration in Australia, scholars are indebted for several studies in this field. *Shadows and Realities of Government; an Introduction to the Study of Organization of the Administrative Agencies of Government with Special Reference to New South Wales* (Workers' Educational Association of N.S.W., Sydney, 1923) stresses the difficulty of drawing a line between politics and administration. *Government in Australia: Selected Readings* (Government Printer, Sydney, 2nd ed., 1944) deals mainly with administrative problems. *Planning in the Modern State* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 2nd ed., 1945) is a reappraisal of Australian government in the light of the emergence of the "social service" state. An excellent analysis of recruitment policies and methods is Robert S. Parker, *Public Service Recruitment in Australia* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1942). The writer, who served in the public service of New South Wales before writing the book and who was at one time on the staff of Canberra University College, is now Professor of Political Science at Victoria University College, Wellington. F. W. Eggleston, *State Socialism in Victoria* (P. S. King & Son, London, 1932), is a study of administrative problems created by the growth of government corporations in Victoria, by a distinguished statesman who was active in the public life of Victoria and the Commonwealth.

Local government is a field largely unexplored, but two recent studies are valuable additions to the scanty material available: Alan Davies, *Local Government in Victoria* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1951); and J. R. H. Johns, *Metropolitan Government in Western Australia* (University of Western Australia Text Books Board, Perth, 1950).

Until recently the interpretation of parties and politics has been left largely to journalists and participants in the struggle. Useful material on the origin of the Labor party and the solidarity controversy is included in George Black, *History of the New South Wales Political Labour Party* (Sydney, 1910). The judgments are those of a participant in the struggle and should be read with that in mind. Charles A. Bernays, *Queensland Politics During Sixty Years, 1859–1919* (Government Printer, Brisbane), is written by a civil servant and the emphasis is personal and anecdotal.

An illuminating account of the tangled series of events leading to the split in the Labor party during the depression of the 1930's, written by a journalist who was at Canberra during the events, is Warren Denning, *Caucus Crisis: The Rise and Fall of the Scullin Government* (Cumberland Argus, Parramatta, N.S.W., 1937). V. G. Childe, *How Labour Governs: A Study of Workers' Representation in Australia* (Labour Publishing Co., London, 1923), is an informative and provocative but tantalizing study of the internal politics of the N.S.W. Labour party from its organization to the early 1920's. From 1919 to 1921 the writer was private secretary to the Premier of New South Wales, but he is now a university professor of prehistoric European archaeology and Director of the Institute of Archaeology in England. A very different interpretation of New South Wales politics in a later period is given in J. T. Lang, *Communism in Australia* (Century Publication, Sydney, 1945). The author, who was the storm center of labor politics for a generation, tends to associate all left-wing groups with Communism. M. H. Ellis, *The Garden Path* (Land Newspapers Ltd., Sydney, 1949), although more objective, is slanted in the same direction.

Although Australia abounds in political gossip, "muckraking" studies have seldom appeared in book form. An exception is Frank J. Hardy, *Power Without Glory* (Realist Printing and Publishing Co., Melbourne, 1950). The publication of this fictionalized but thinly disguised tale of "machine politics" in Victoria was followed by a sensational (but unsuccessful) suit for libel.

Comprehensive, objective analyses of the structure and functioning of parties are few. Hancock's interpretive work, *Australia*, cited above, includes material on parties. Another brief, provocative sketch is G. V. Portus, "Political Parties," Australian Institute of International Affairs, *Australian Policies*, *Political and Strategic* (Supplementary Papers, Series D, No. 1, 1938). To these vignettes, two longer studies have recently been added. F. W. (Sir Frederic) Eggleston is a distinguished elder statesman who has played a prominent part in Australian public life for many years and his book, *Reflections of an Australian Liberal* (F. W. Cheshire, Melbourne, published for the Australian National University, 1953), is partly an analysis of the structure and policies of present-day parties and partly an appeal for a revival of liberalism. The book includes a series of tables showing the vote for members of the Commonwealth House and Senate, 1901–1951, and the composition of federal and state governments for each year since federation, which scholars will find invaluable. A second recent, comprehensive study is Louise Overacker, *The Australian Party System* (Yale University Press, New Haven, and Oxford University Press, London, 1952).

Among the discussions of political issues by political leaders, several are worth citing. W. M. Hughes, *The Case for Labour* (Workers Trustees, Sydney, 1910), is a defense by an early leader of Labor, identified above. The emphasis of H. V. Evatt, *Liberalism in Australia* (Sweet and Maxwell, London, and Law Book Co., Sydney, 1918), is largely historical. Robert G. Menzies, *The Forgotten People* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1943), which brings together a series of radio addresses, is a useful guide to the ideas of the present leader of the Liberal party. The aims and policies of the Labor party in the postwar period, 1945–1951, as well as of its late leader, are reflected in J. B. Chifley, *Things Worth Fighting For*, a volume of speeches selected and arranged by A. W. Stargardt (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1952).

Problems of foreign policy are only beginning to claim the attention of scholars. Between the world wars, the Australian Institute of International Affairs published several useful studies, among them *Australian Foreign Policy, 1935–1936* (published for use at the sixth conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, 1936); *Australia in the Commonwealth* (Australian Economic Policies, Series B); *Australia and the Pacific* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1944).

F. W. Eggleston, *Australia in World Affairs* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1946), is a collection of speeches and articles of the statesman identified above, whose career included diplomatic service. Sir John Latham, later Chief Justice of the High Court, is the author of *Australia and the British Commonwealth* (Macmillan, London, 1929). *Foreign Policy of Australia* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1945) and *Australia in World Affairs* (Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1946) are valuable collections of speeches and articles by H. V. Evatt, who served as Minister for External Affairs.

A recent book by an American, written largely from official sources, is Werner Levi, *American-Australian Relations* (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1947). Nicholas Mansergh, *Survey of British Commonwealth Affairs: Problems of External Policy, 1931–1939* (Oxford University Press, London, 1952), prepared under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, is a valuable study covering a wide scope.

W. Macmahon Ball, Professor of Political Science at the University of Melbourne, who served as a member of the Allied Council for Japan, has written two critical analyses of Far Eastern problems and policies: *Japan, Enemy or Ally?* (Cassell, London; rev. and enlarged ed., John Day Co., New York, 1949); and *Notes on Nationalism and Communism in East Asia* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1952). Although written for school children, R. M. Crawford, *Ourselves and the Pacific* (Melbourne University Press, 3rd ed. rev., 1952), is of value to adults as well.

More specialized in emphasis are Myra Willard, *The History of the White Australian Policy* (Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1923); and W. D. Borrie, *Population Trends and Policies; A Study in Australian and World Demography* (Australasian Publishing Co., Sydney, 1948).

In concluding this section, it may be well to emphasize that although articles in journals, and papers published by the Australian Institute of Political Science, are not listed above, material of great importance will be found there. Also, scholars visiting Australian universities and libraries will do well to seek out theses and manuscripts as yet unpublished, for as has been pointed out recently by an Australian, "too much original research, especially in the social sciences, at present never gets beyond the walls of the classroom; some other countries suffer from an endless outpouring of academic pamphlets but we are far from that position in Australia."[2]

LOUISE OVERACKER.

Wellesley College.

---

[2] Geoffrey Sawer, in a review of T. P. Fry's *Australian Contributions to the Evolution of Parliamentary Government*, in *Historical Studies—Australia and New Zealand*, Vol. 3, pp. 349–50 (Feb., 1949).

BOOK REVIEWS

Holmes-Laski Letters: The Correspondence of Mr. Justice Holmes and Harold J. Laski, 1916–1935. Vols. I and II. Edited by Mark DeWolfe Howe. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1953. Pp. xvi, 1650. $12.50.)

In *Causeries de Lundi* Sainte-Beuve remarks, about Chateaubriand: "As all who have known M. de Chateaubriand know that those things occupied a great place in his life, it follows that these Memoirs, which tell so many truths to all the world and about himself, do not, however, contain everything about him, unless they are supplemented by a commentary." This vast *Holmes-Laski Correspondence,* somewhat esoteric in bibliophil reference and pepperings in Greek and Latin but of undoubted future interest, properly enough carries no such additional commentary—although we are told that omissions have been made, dictated by "the limits set by the caution of British publishers," presumably about libel. (The comments of Sir Ernest Barker, Harold Laski's Oxford tutor, about the earlier years would be peculiarly illuminating.) Nevertheless, a large number of conversations between public figures are here recorded. In some cases all present are now dead. The professional concern of the future historian and student of politics will be how far the records are in good faith and reliable. The commentary, therefore, here even more than with Chateaubriand, is strictly necessary.

In these letters we see an almost grandpaternal relation of the correspondents. Indeed in corresponding with Laski, who had what Holmes calls his capacity "to wiggle himself in," Holmes declares he feels "like the Vicar of Wakefield corresponding with the Prime Minister." On the one side is the debonaire Associate Justice, the friends of his youth mostly dead, himself part Nestor, part Voltairean *philosophe;* tough-minded (an "adult male" is the favored term); sceptical of all nonsense about natural rights when the ultimate issue is who can kill whom; in revolt against his Boston upbringings and relishing a bit of neat blasphemy; a rationalist foe of all clergy, but cloaked by a venerable age and an immense respectability. On the other side, we have the precocious youth, twenty-three when the story begins; ready with slashing literary judgements; admiring Lytton Strachey but summing up Marx as "somewhat scatter-brained" who "can't think organically"; much more than, in Judge Learned Hand's phrase "a smart chap," full of what has been called "intellectual fizz." He is immensely flattered by the correspondence, but has a more than feminine gift for saying, when he chooses, what others will wish to hear; a fastidious aspirant dedicated to "fine thought" and the exhilarating adventure of ideas—"that fellow just breathed mind of the highest quality," he says of Leslie Stephen; himself in such pell-mell reaction against the orthodox Judaism of his father as almost thereby to explain his theory of authority in the state; with an almost religious enthusiasm for atheism; thinking that "sometimes a bathe in blood can change the world." "What swoops down on me is the barriers between things, not their unity." This comment in the earliest letters may provide the key to the whole position, may indicate something more fundamental than any liberalism of his first phases, and may explain his conviction that all pursuit of social harmony is bogus and cowardly evasion of "facts." "I take it that the interests of capital and labour are irreconcilable in fundamentals." It is extremely important to note that Laski began as a biology student, an admirer of Galton, until warned by his tutor, Julian Huxley's colleague, that he had not the appropriate mind. In the earlier letters those who know only the later career will be surprised to read the creed: "I am a Darwinian . . . merely by education John Smith won't become Adam Smith." As for Marx, so with him, the struggle for survival, unredeemed by the religious bond of fraternity, ended by becoming the social war *à l'outrance* of classes, where the weak voice of reason was merely an echo from private worlds of experience determined by chances of birth.

The position of Mr. Justice Holmes in legal history is assured and not much affected by these letters of a veteran, a fine old heathen if ever there was one. He expresses a very (modern) American, approximately pragmatic but in the last analysis Hobbesian and (in this reviewer's opinion) quite deplorable view of the bases of law. If there is, as President Eisenhower's Inaugural Address suggests, a revival of Stoic-Christian natural law doctrine, the trend will be away from him. Of socialists he declared, without demur from his young friend, that he had never read one "that I didn't think talked drool . . . some essays by the great Webb . . . I thought were slobber." However, of a particular viewpoint, shaped in the mood of aggressive competition of the last century, he is a most distinguished expositor.

The case of Laski, here illuminated, is more complex. This reviewer recalls being bitterly castigated by a distinguished professor of the London School of Economics for describing Laski as a genius, even if on a small scale. It is indeed amazing that neither Harvard nor Yale chose to give him even an assistant professorship. Maybe Mr. Holmes made him and spoiled him. He had his own notions of a good time: "we destroyed a goodly number of existing reputations, that always seems to me quite the most pleasing way of being malicious"; there is "that place between malice and wit where wisdom dwells." He was a brilliant anecdotalist, a most learned man; his earlier liberal work, before he aspired to write corrective footnotes to Marx, will remain against criticism; in his later years political colleagues found him pompous to the point of boredom. He was never as influential on either side of the Atlantic as the other side supposed. Generous to a fault towards his *protegés* and those who accepted his patronage, he was not only arrogant but waspishly vindictive to those who opposed his purposes. His political judgement—in 1920 when he expected civil war in Britain; in 1921, when he allowed Lloyd George ten years more power; in 1931, when he spoke of a Labour victory; and onwards—was quite singularly poor. In this *Correspondence* neither Mr. Attlee, Mr. Morrison, nor (by name) Mr. Bevin earns mention, although one gathers that, in 1924, the dockers turned to Laski to win their case. In public a partisan to the finger tips, this did not prevent for Laski attempts at a correspondence with Premier Baldwin, which maybe earned the encomium that Laski was dictator of Labour party theory. That he was able, as he stated, to regard the English "with the attachment of an outsider" perhaps explains why, later, for long Ernest Bevin declined to reply to his letters and Attlee advised him that his best service to the party would be to keep quiet.

Truth to tell, Laski was a species of academic Baron Munchausen—a matter which gravely concerns the future historian and makes "commentaries" imperative. From the days of C. M. Lloyd, of the London School and the *New Statesman*, to the present, the stories come back. This reviewer, in some cases from direct knowledge and elsewhere by written inquiry, is aware of inaccuracies of statement, feeding to a soaring vanity, which, even when small, like Ouida's famous statement "none rowed as fast as stroke," give the case away. The unkind would have a brutal name for this corruption of the currency, that circulates among men of integrity, such as has long ceased to be amusing. With our own ears we have heard Laski describing apocryphal conversations with the King (whose constitutional position he endeavoured—without having "a drop of English blood in his veins," as he says—to redefine). His claim has been heard of that he was due to go to the House of Lords, there to lead his party—an allegation which, on the highest authority, can be stated to have been manufactured out of whole cloth, unsupported by a tittle of truth. The historian of the future will be wise to accept no statement from this source without independent confirmation.[1] The judgement of a kinsman that "I don't think I have known anyone in the world so conceited," is condoned when one finds him dismissing Gandhi as, if the salt of the earth, yet an "intolerable bore," and as having "no political sense whatever," or when, at the time of the 1931 Conference, we were coolly told: "Sankey made me try to bring the Mohammedans to reason and I had their leader" (who does not impinge enough on Laski's consciousness to rise beyond anonymity) "here for hours trying to find a basis for discussion." One recalls the apocryphal remark of Poincaré: "Laski, we have gone into the Ruhr. Now what shall we do with it?" It is pitiful.

Let us ascend from this mire of human frailty. Laski had a most brilliant intellect, spoiled by defects of character. It is yet by his work in theory that he will be judged. Indeed he sought to summon his contemporaries to that bar. M. Julien Benda speaks of a treason of the clerks because of a bitter partisanship. Perhaps Benda is wrong. There is yet a graver charge. Laski alleged, in the libel case which he lost with costs, that he did not declare that the forcible overthrow of present government lay in history's near-inevitabilities. His social philosophy was yet, as touching current events, deeply pessimistic, even more Darwinian than Marxist, and explained his statement that, if Britain had to choose between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., she would, he knew, choose the U.S.S.R. In his posthumous *Dilemma of Our Times*, he not only sees in Mr. Churchill the organizer "of the counter-revolution," but says: "The Truman doctrine, as soon as it is seriously applied, means the endowment with American strength of all the interests which seek to prevent the working class from winning its place in the sun." It was rather of this view that he was proud as Lucifer, and this which was distinctive, than that detestation of those who "impose a yoke worse than slavery" on humble folk from vulgar lust for profit, which distinction was characteristic of many good men whom he frankly despised. Whatever his early doubts, the pessimist in him had overwhelmed, in the noise of arms of the social war, the apologist, with Russell, of scientific rationalism. The "red-blooded" or "masculine" approach seemed to be that of condoning massacre on a scale that made the French Revolution pale, since it was necessary in the ungodly Darwinian struggle. One must not (who knows why?) cause pain, it seems, except when having malicious fun or "when necessary." When is "necessary"? The answer must depend upon our judgement of the human capacity for peaceful change, the old order yielding to the new. "Thus far," says Laski, "in history all the evidence is against this assumption."

---

[1] In December, 1921 Laski claimed, in a letter to Holmes (Vol. 1, p. 386) that he had been seeing Winston Churchill once a week for a month for as long as one and a half hours, in personal argument, and that he had submitted a formula for settlement of the Irish question, which was in the end almost verbally accepted. On May 13, 1953, this reviewer received a written message from Sir Winston Churchill that he "does not remember ever having heard of him [Laski] in connection with the Irish settlement of 1921." A check of certain academic references produces not dissimilar results.

Christian civilization rests on certain fundamental affirmations, however imperfectly implemented. Whether these affirmations can be made is today of critical importance for civilization and survival. Marxo-Darwinism (and neo-Darwinism is the more dangerous part of the compound) is, to put the matter mildly, not one of the affirmations. The comment about Christian affirmations holds true of the civilization of Islam and of the orthodox Judaism of Nathan Laski, Harold's father. The affirmations of the three have much in common. A civilization fails when, in Malraux's words, "it doubts its own credentials." With a brilliant pen and clever mind, deeply believing a Napoleon to be less influential than those who hold the pen, and spurred on by a vast ambition, Laski encouraged pessimistic doubt and, culturally, as much as any single man of our age, sold the pass of the West, substituting the mood of defeatism for that of reform. The particular good he did (for example as a busy arbitrator who did not in principle approve of arbitration) must not be overlooked, nor yet his early adversities which brewed the poison of resentments. But to know much of talent is not to forgive all but to demand much. It would be more a hypocrisy than a deliberate act of charity not to make on him the same comment that he made on Lord Keynes: "Keynes' personality seems to me not a national asset." Had he lived and his influence been greater than in fact it was, he might have made inevitable a schism in the Labour party of Britain, by causing the revolt of those unable to share his views, and maybe even the establishment there, as elsewhere exists in Europe, of a Christian Social party. His high water mark in this connection was perhaps his preface of praise in 1948 to the Communist Manifesto of Karl Marx, of whom he nevertheless declared, "really I loathe the fellow." The bulk of his compatriots, if such he regarded them (Vol. I, pp. 113, 303), he seems to dismiss as "servile." He provides, I will therefore say, to his contemporaries, not a lighthouse signal but a wrecker's lamp. The skilful mariner will note and avoid it. In the relevant words of M. Sainte-Beuve: "And why should I not speak of him? . . . the time of illusions and indulgence is past; it is absolutely necessary to speak truths."

GEORGE CATLIN.

University of California, Berkeley.

The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science. BY DAVID EASTON. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1953. Pp. xxiii, 320. $5.00.)

In this important book an able young political theorist endeavors with considerable success to show that American political theorists generally are today making very little contribution to political science, to indicate the reasons for their failure, and to suggest what he thinks they need to do. Many of his specific analyses and arguments meet with this reviewer's approval. For example, his statement of the scope of politics, and his arguments that neither "power" nor "the state" is coextensive with the human activities called politics, are to me very acceptable. Other examples of what I consider to be good judgment and cogent argument could easily be given. My adverse criticisms of the work go to the central conceptions and to the argument of the book as a whole.

1. The title and the subtitle are both open to objections but for different reasons. By his title, "The Political System," the author means the aggregate of interrelated human activities having to do with the formation and effectuation of community policies for "the authoritative allocation of values for a society." This defines the scope of political studies, as distinguished from economic, anthropological and sociological studies, for example, but the book is not primarily about political activities or "The Political System." Instead it is mainly about the work of a small number of scholars called political theorists.

The subtitle, "An Inquiry into the State of Political Science," is also somewhat misleading. The author pays some attention to studies in the field of political behavior, but mainly he deals with political theory, political theorists, and the historians of political thought. Political science in the United States embraces other large fields of scholarship—public law, public administration, political parties, and international relations, for example—none of which receive any substantial consideration in this book. In short, the book is mainly about political theorists and what they need to do to begin to earn their salt.

2. The failure of political theorists in the United States to provide political scientists with any significant theoretical framework for their studies in either the moral or the "causal" branches thereof, is the main theme of the argument throughout the book. "Theory has become increasingly remote from the mainstream of political research" (Preface, p. ix). Despite this asserted failure of political theorists, the author argues insistently for the importance of the theorist in bringing order out of the vast but chaotic and disconnected accumulations of facts that other students of politics have provided. Indeed he seems to

argue for the continuing need to have an autonomous group of theorists, separate or at least clearly distinguishable from other political scientists.

How did it come about that political theory has failed so completely and has become so irrelevant to the other studies in politics? From a number of scattered passages in the book (pp. 9, 43, 101, 231, 234–35, 313, 314), I get the impression that the author believes that once upon a time political theorists and political theory were far better than they are today. In that golden age, whenever it was, there were political theorists or social philosophers who grasped and combined into vital philosophies both the moral side and the causal or empirical side of the study of politics. From those greater days of political theory there has been a "decline," a fall from grace. The assumption seems to be that once the original sin or sins have been brought to their attention, present-day political theorists may see the evil of their ways and reform themselves. With more modesty than others who have made similar "discoveries," the author of the work before me does not hold himself out as the Messiah who has found the way to salvation.

3. I have grave doubts about this entire interpretation of what has happened, and I also doubt that the hoped-for outcome of this appeal to political theorists to reform themselves will come to pass. What interests me even more, however, is the phraseology in which much of the argument is stated. The pages are heavy with "the mood of our age," "the pessimism of our times," and similar gloomy phrases. The author stands at least part of the time with certain other theorists who carry the weight of the world upon their minds (I do not say upon their shoulders). They do not seem to be able to recognize change simply as change, or to accept the universe as it is or the human race as it has revealed itself through the centuries. From their viewpoint almost everything is in decline. To dare to speak in their presence of such a thing as progress is to brand oneself as an abysmally ignorant person. But having read a great deal of history, and having lived through Spengler, Pareto, Toynbee, and other heavy thinkers of recent decades without having been infected with their gloom, I simply cannot take seriously much of the vague pessimism that I find in some parts of this book. This sort of world-pessimism seems to me to be a disease that is limited in its incidence to a small class of intellectuals who take themselves too seriously. The rest of the human race is hardly aware of their mental sickness. Fortunately I find evidences that the author of this book does not have a serious case.

4. Also characteristic of large sections of the book is a vague, theoretical, and sometimes metaphorical language that is rather far removed from politics as observable human activity. The vocabulary includes numerous "isms," from behaviorism through communism, empiricism, historicism, historism, optimism, pessimism, positivism, relationism, relativism, scholasticism, scientism, socialism, sociologism, traditionalism, and so on to utilitarianism. At least some of these terms are of such doubtful meaning as to have little value in a scientific discussion. Also noticeable is the author's tendency to use abstract collective nouns as if they represented real self-operating entities. Thus, "There are few social theories that do not show some *insight* into the problems *they* seek to

solve, . . . " (p. 21) and "Although *it* had discovered the natural tendency towards progress, social science did not deny *itself* a further useful role" (p. 15; italics mine). It is *men* who try to solve problems and who may possibly have insights. Social theories and social science are merely collective names for the varied results that certain students and writers have produced. They are not living entities that have insight or that "seek to solve" problems.

5. The author's argument in general is based upon a sort of dichotomy. The study of politics is one, but it has two sides—the moral, or what men would do if they were to do right—and the "causal," or what men do in fact and more or less under necessity. For the moral side, the author says there is value theory but he does not insist upon any empirical study. To accept empirical study for the moral side would be to embrace relativism and that is one of the great sins. In this realm, therefore, it is the role of the political theorist to seek to clarify his own moral principles to himself, but how this is to be done does not appear.

For help in the study of the causal side of politics, there is causal theory and there are empirical methods of testing theories. The author clearly believes that much more can be done by political theorists in the direction of developing causal theories of politics. He apparently expects these theories to be broad and general, but of such nature that *in principle* they might be tested by empirical data. Other workers in the study of politics will presumably have to analyze these theories and separate them into parts that can be tested empirically and then find the ways of so testing them (pp. 315–16). Arguing for "the autonomy of theoretical research," the author does not sufficiently consider the alternative of giving the empirical workers better training in theory and in research methods so that they can develop their own hypotheses and theories more successfully in connection with their specific research projects.

I have a feeling that the time has not yet arrived when all-comprehensive theories of politics, such as the author seems to think the theorists should produce, can be of much assistance to those workers who are studying men in politics at first hand. The general equilibrium theories discussed in Chapter 11 illustrate what I have in mind. Many tools of research will have to be developed and many limited theories will need to be worked out by well-trained students of actual politics before the conditions will be ripe for the Einstein of politics to concoct a general field or equilibrium theory. And to ask political theorists to assume responsibility for two great areas, that is, for moral theory and for political theory in the causal sense, is asking far too much of them.

6. There are many other things in this book that call for analysis and comment. Thus while the distinctions made in Chapter 10 between the writings of Dunning, McIlwain, and Sabine are of considerable interest and acuteness, the adverse criticism of these men as if they were "American political theorists" is, I think, unjustified. Two of these men were trained as historians, and all three in their principal works were writing histories of political thought and not pretending to put forth their own political theories. If their "historical approach has managed to crush the life out of value theory" (p. 235), if, in short,

the value theories in politics discussed by these men were such frail blossoms that they could not stand up against the winds of historical analysis, their chances of survival must in any case have been very small.

But enough of these comments and criticisms. This book still has great merits. The author is both modest and optimistic, despite certain overtones of pessimism. He searches courageously and intelligently for ways in which political theorists might contribute more significantly to political science. He is open-minded and even friendly toward empirical methods of study. He is moving, I believe, in a direction in which there is hope of finding increasing light.

WILLIAM ANDERSON.

University of Minnesota.

Essays on Church and State. BY LORD ACTON. EDITED BY DOUGLAS WOODRUFF. (New York: Viking Press. Pp. vi, 518. $6.00.)

Lord Acton: A Study in Conscience and Politics. BY GERTRUDE HIMMELFARB. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1952. Pp. x, 260. $3.75.)

Acton's Political Philosophy: An Analysis. BY G. E. FASNACHT. (New York: Viking Press. Pp. xiv, 265. $4.00.)

For the past two decades the reassessment of the Victorians has been proceeding apace, and since the war it has conspicuously accelerated—a fact not without significance for the student of opinion. The simultaneous appearance of these three books relating to Acton (who has not figured prominently in the more popular studies) is further evidence of an obvious trend. It could even mark the beginning of a cult.

Acton is a fascinating figure however you look at him, and in some respects a tragic one too. He was not only one of the most encyclopedic scholars since Comenius, but also a considerable social prophet. And as a public "character" affiliated with the aristocracy (both lay and ecclesiastical) of four countries, he was a man around whom legends grew even in his own lifetime. Testimony to his prodigious learning is incontrovertible. Gladstone, Bryce, Creighton and scores of others in the worlds of scholarship and politics bear witness to its astonishing range and depth. Andrew White called him "the nearest approach to omniscience" he had known, and Arnold Toynbee regards him as "one of the greatest minds among Western historians." It was commonly said of him that he knew everyone in Europe worth knowing and had read every book in Europe worth reading (for he was quadrilingual from childhood). Yet despite this fabulous erudition, and despite the elaborate preparation he made for a wide variety of studies ranging from pagan religions to the French Revolution, he did not write a single book. To this day the paralyzing effect of his perfectionist standards of scholarship is referred to in British university common rooms as "Acton's disease." His influence (and considerable it was) was exerted through journalism, book reviews, personal contacts with statesmen and scholars, and finally after 1895 as Regius Professor at Cambridge University. Since his death fifty-one years ago, five volumes of his lectures and essays have been brought out by friends and disciples. Now Mr. Woodruff brings us a sixth consisting of essays and book reviews which Acton contributed in his twenties and thirties to the Liberal Catholic journals he edited. Of one of those journals Matthew Arnold said: "perhaps in no organ of criticism in this country was there so much knowledge, so much play of mind." The contributions here reprinted still remain both a delight and a provocation. But when one has finished these 450 pages, one is left marvelling at Acton's conception of the general reader, for few but specialists are likely to get much out of them today. The editor provides no explanatory notes; on the other hand, he introduces the volume with a gracious and scholarly essay giving us the immediate background against which the essays were written.

Acton merits the critical consideration of social scientists today, however, for reasons other than the profundity of his learning and the contributions he made to historiography. For him history was more than a tale that is told: it was the raw material for a philosophy of social life, and immanent within its data were enduring issues to be disentangled and analyzed to the betterment of living. Those fundamental issues that troubled him unceasingly for most of half a century are the same that beset the world today, so that there is literal truth in Miss Himmelfarb's contention that "he is, indeed, one of our great contemporaries." Acton's teaching may thus be likened to a rich fugue in which he interweaves the variations on several recurrent themes: in particular, the nature of freedom, the relation of values to property and power, the problem of Church and state, and the implications of ideology for the political process. And as counterpoint to those themes run his four emphatic repudiations: namely, of racialism, of autocracy, of majoritarianism, and of nationalism.

Acton's appeal is especially cogent for our generation because of the distinctive quality of his politics. This Anglo-Bavarian aristocrat grew into an uncompromising liberal, defiant of autocracy in the Church as well as in the state, believing passionately in both the sovereignty of the individual conscience and the corporative organization of society. But his was essentially a Christian liberalism in striking contrast to the classic liberalism that derived from French rationalism and Benthamite utilitarianism. For whereas the latter rested essentially on an optimistic view of the malleability of human nature, Acton's liberalism was firmly grounded on the pessimistic conception of original sin—a postulate he immortalized in his best-known epigram about the corrupting consequences of power. It is this fact that makes him the fellow of Maritain and the French MRP thinkers today.

All these matters are effectively set forth by Miss Himmelfarb in her able monograph. It is, she says, "not so much the biography of a life as the biography of a mind." This is not an easy distinction to sustain, though on the whole she sustains it successfully. Her purpose is to present Acton's thought as developing in response to the personal and public issues that confronted him. She makes us appreciate the astonishing precocity of the young Munich-trained scholar who began to be a public influence at the age of 24. She communicates to us the zeal with which he returned to England to establish a sort of lay apostolate of his own to proclaim Liberal Catholicism and convince the obscurantists (especially in the hierarchy) that Catholic Christianity had nothing to fear from the new learning, either historical or scientific. She makes us feel the anguish of his failure, both in that and in his momentous struggle to prevent Pius IX from proclaiming the dogma of papal infallibility. And with remarkable sympathy she enables us to see how, in the course of this unfolding, his politics changed from a Burkean Toryism that accepted the deliverance of history to a Gladstonian Liberalism that virtually repudiated it. Yet from beginning to end he never lost his profound Catholic piety. The man who called the papacy the "fiend skulking behind the Crucifix" could also say "I am not conscious that I ever in my life held the slightest shadow of a doubt about any dogma of the Catholic Church."

Of biographical narrative Miss Himmelfarb gives us only the necessary minimum: so much so, in fact, that at times she becomes almost laconic. Yet her sharply-drawn purpose, so consistently maintained, gives an austere precision to the entire work. Within the limits of that purpose, this is an immensely satisfying study which does what has not been done before, and in the process makes an important contribution to the history of Victorian culture. Miss Himmelfarb is not merely master of her materials; she uses them with the unobtrusiveness of mature discrimination. The cool clarity of her style is admirably suited to her theme; she speaks throughout with the quiet voice of sensitivity; and when she comes to deal with the more tense situations, she handles them with a terseness that catches some of Acton's own epigrammatic quality.

There are a few things that even the most grateful reader may think are not dealt with as adequately as they might be. For example, Miss Himmelfarb fails to make us understand just how and why the young Acton lost his early enthusiasm for Macaulay. And she does not make us feel the true inwardness of Acton's antipathy towards Cardinal Newman; we merely learn that at some unspecified point, an intellectual incompatibility had grown into a personal animosity. Perhaps, too, she underemphasizes Acton's stress upon economic motivation and his high regard for Harrington; certainly she does not indicate the fissure this produced in his thinking. But these are relatively minor complaints. The great thing about this book is that it evokes anew enthusiasm for a majestic figure, and that it sends one back to Acton's own essays with deeper understanding. It even impels one to go beyond the monograph itself and to venture into the territory which Miss Himmelfarb purposely avoids—that is to say, the intriguing field of Acton's complex psychology and the turbulent intricacies of his personal relationships.

When we turn to Mr. Fasnacht's book we experience an acute disappointment, alike for the great opportunity the author has missed and for the banality with which he executes the limited design he has undertaken. The book purports to be an exposition of the salient features of Acton's thinking, but it turns out to be mainly a concatenation of quotations and paraphrases grouped under such obvious chapter headings as "The Idea of Development," "The History of Freedom," and so forth. Even at that there is little skill in presentation;

frequently one cannot tell whether the author is giving his own opinion or paraphrasing Acton; and the deadly monotony of the author's simple declaratory sentences militates against sustained interest. At times the comments reach a remarkable depth of banality. ("Acton's ultimate thought is that it is the truth that makes us free. And the ultimate truth is that Caesar and God are different.")

The book has a measure of usefulness, however, either as an anthology or as a first-level exposition of Acton's teaching, the more so as Mr. Fasnacht has conscientiously incorporated much material from Acton's unpublished manuscripts in the University Library at Cambridge. But despite its title, there is far more history than analysis in it. In fact, the fundamental philosophic issues raised by Acton's political ideas are not considered at all. His concepts are not critically examined; the presuppositions of his thinking are not laid bare; the shifts and contradictions within his system are not explained or discussed. Even some of Acton's central ideas are cavalierly handled: thus, the implications of his pluralism are not pressed; his theory of "revolution in permanence" is not critically considered; and ultramontanism gets only two references in the index, though no Catholic writer of modern times carried further than Acton did the distinction between the Divine Church and the human ecclesiastical institution. Most astonishing of all in a book bearing this title, there is no attempt to discuss Acton's conception of political science (a term he frequently used) even though that is central to the whole issue. But it is not merely the absence of these things that is the most regrettable feature of the book; rather is it the fact that the author seems so oblivious of their relevance to the material he is handling and the topic he professes to be discussing. Yet the consideration of Acton's philosophy of politics and history is singularly timely: as timely, indeed, as the current discussions of David Easton's inquiry into our discipline.

C. H. DRIVER.

Yale University.

The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana. BY RUSSELL KIRK. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. 1953. Pp. 458. $6.50.)

The Conservative Mind is a study of political and social conservatism written, be it noted, by an unabashed conservative. Professor Russell Kirk of Michigan State, who already enjoys a solid reputation as historian of ideas thanks to his incisive *Randolph of Roanoke*, has brought together a series of essays about British and American conservative thinkers in a book marked by candor, discipline, erudition, and grace. Burke and John Adams are his two favorite political thinkers, but respectful, often loving treatment is also bestowed on such diverse figures as Scott, Canning, Coleridge, Randolph, Calhoun, Macaulay, Fenimore Cooper, de Tocqueville, John Quincy Adams, Brownson, Hawthorne, Disraeli, Newman, Maine, Godkin, Henry and Brooks Adams, Mallock, Babbitt, More, and Santayana. The sum of these essays is a study that must certainly be acknowledged one of the most valuable contributions to intellectual history of the past decade.

Professor Kirk's philosophy of conservatism is in the great tradition. At the outset he establishes his "canons of conservative thought": (1) belief in a universal moral order supported and sanctioned by religion; (2) affection for the variety and mystery of traditional life; (3) conviction that civilization is grounded upon orders and classes, the only true equality being moral equality; (4) belief in the inseparability of property and freedom; (5) faith in Burkean prescription; and (6) recognition that change and reform are not necessarily the same thing. And at the conclusion he restates these canons in terms of modern issues. The new conservatism, he believes strongly, must be grounded in an affirmation of the moral nature of society, must defend property ("property diffused and defined, property in the form of homes and pensions and corporate rights and private enterprises"), must preserve local liberties and divided political power, and above all must approach the complexities of modern society in a spirit of true "national humility."

The canons of conservatism, writes Professor Kirk, have been menaced by at least five major schools of radical thought: Rationalism, Romanticism, Utilitarianism, Positivism, and Collectivistic Materialism. The common ground from which these schools have proceeded to the attack on the prescriptive arrangement of society are: (1) belief in the perfectibility of man and unlimited social progress, (2) contempt for tradition, (3) political leveling, and (4) economic leveling. The author reserves his particular scorn for Rousseau, Bentham, Marx, and John Dewey, the chief purveyors of these utopian ideas.

Professor Kirk's stand for conservatism is staunch and uncompromising. It is refreshing to meet an historian of political and social ideas willing to go on record with statements like these: of Emerson—"His specific political notions are almost shocking—frightening in the first instance for their perilous naïveté, in the second instance for their easy indifference to uncomfortable facts"; of Babbitt's *Democracy and Leadership*—"perhaps the most penetrating work on politics ever written by an American"; of the Civil War and Reconstruction —"that hurricane-fanned conflagration of reforming enthusiasm and sinful appetite"; of Paul Elmer More—"possibly the most redoubtable American theologian of any communion." It should be said in the author's behalf that he never fires one of these broadsides without carefully training his guns. His scholarship is manifestly of the highest order.

In dealing with this subject, especially in dealing with it in so clear and committed a spirit, Professor Kirk has laid himself open to serious attack. Limitations of space do not permit a full catalogue of possible chinks in his armor, but certainly it would seem proper to point out what may well be the most serious defect of the book: the implicit assumption, occasionally made explicit but never really supported by conclusive evidence, that all our present discontents may be traced back to the forces of lustful, shallow, irreligious liberalism loosed upon the West by the French Revolution. The historian of ideas has a deep obligation not to put too much faith in the power of ideas.

In his presidential address to the American Historical Association several years ago, Samuel Eliot Morison called for a history of the United States from the conservative point of view, a study that would parallel Keith Feiling's *History of England.* Professor Kirk's performance in *The Conservative Mind* leads this reviewer to believe that he might very well be the person for whom Professor Morison is looking. Certainly the so-called "new conservatism" of the postwar period takes on new substance and meaning with the publication of this splendid book.

CLINTON ROSSITER.

Cornell University.

United States Foreign Policy: Its Organization and Control. BY WILLIAM YANDELL ELLIOTT, CHAIRMAN OF STUDY GROUP. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1952. Pp. xviii, 288. $3.75.)

During 1950–51 six men held systematic discussion of the conduct of American foreign affairs, under the auspices of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation. All of them—William Yandell Elliott, McGeorge Bundy, Harry D. Gideonse, George F. Kennan, Don K. Price, and Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.—were experienced in some aspect of administration in addition to being students of government. Professor Elliott, their chairman, drafted this report to present the consensus of the group. It makes good reading for professionals, but it also shows again the disturbing fact that professional students, while still not sure of many answers, are far ahead of the officials of government who flounder helplessly in the mounting questions of this area.

The possibility of major constitutional changes to set up integrated government is, inevitably, discussed inconclusively. Aside from this possibility, the group held two other views, one that smaller constitutional changes should serve the desperate need for reform, the other that leadership and education can bring sufficient change. They agreed that constitutional amendments are desirable to set up approval of treaties by an absolute majority in both houses of Congress, to provide a four-year term for members of the House, to give the President an item veto for appropriation acts, and to make the electoral vote more representative of the popular vote. Within the present Constitution they think the President and Congress must get along together in more understanding if the contemporary difficulties are to be solved in any degree.

Some general points keep returning. One is the fact that no organization, no procedure can be a substitute for the personal leadership of the President and key members of Congress. Another is the fact that military policy is an integral part of foreign policy and should be recognized as such. By inference the group extends the principle that war is much too important to be left in the hands of generals to a principle that all military policy matters are too important to be left in the hands of generals. The military posture of the United States is basic in foreign relations and its definition is basic foreign policy.

The group accepted the need for a strong congressional role in foreign relations and rejected the elite theories of public opinion but agreed that the electorate could give only "programmatic" direction to government, that parties should have more discipline and show more responsibility, and that professional services should be extended in diplomacy by raising the whole civil service in this field to the professional level of the career foreign service. "Regardless of what specific methods of reform seemed most persuasive to us individually, as a Group we agreed without question on (a) the new importance of associating congressional leadership with the Executive Branch in the formulation of policy; (b) the importance of giving the President enough leverage to overcome the particularist tendencies of executive departments; (c) the importance of associating department heads, and departments generally, with the President and his office in the formulation of policy; and (d) the importance of giving the President adequate authority and staff for this purpose."

As we might expect, the theme is sombre for coherence and continuity of foreign policy within our present organization and practice of government. This group of scholars, observant and thoughtful men, have combined an approach to the ideal condition with a sense of politics and what can be accomplished. It is no discredit to them to say that they have not proposed the final remedies. Only the naive can be positive about remedies in this aspect of government since the nation entered a new condition in World War II. Trial and error will almost surely test all proposed solutions. Meanwhile the scholars, as represented by this group in 1950–51, are far beyond public officials in their recognition of the great danger in our institutional incompetence. They may not have the final answers, but they are proposing the changes that can be tried and tested for further change. Unless public officials make the changes, the problems become more difficult by the day and the danger of national disaster becomes a greater threat.

It will be ironic indeed if history records the United States as the nation that studied government organization the most but fell because it refused to change its organization, or the nation that had the greatest power of this era but failed because it could not work out organization and coordination in the conduct of foreign affairs. The Woodrow Wilson Foundation and the Study Group are to be thanked for this serious, advanced, and sensible discussion of matters that may mean the life or death of this strong nation.

JAMES L. MCCAMY.

University of Wisconsin.

The Great Frontier. BY WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1953. Pp. xiii, 434. $5.00.)

Sixty years ago this December, Frederick Jackson Turner delivered at Chicago his famous paper on "The Significance of the Frontier in American History." By this one short essay, with its revolutionary impact, Turner won general acceptance for his thesis that the key to American development and to the American character lay in the presence, for three hundred years, of a copious supply of free land at the edge of settlement.

For a generation, no one challenged Turner's *dicta*, and then, in the twenties, an increasing body of criticism began to develop. This criticism centered upon two features: the agrarian limitations and the nationalistic limitations of

Turner's theories. Instead of recognizing the influence of varied resources such as copper, coal, timber, iron, and petroleum, Turner concerned himself almost solely with the abundance of cultivable soil, and thus his thesis was restricted in its application to our agrarian age, when it might have served as a key to our industrial age as well. Further, preoccupation with the thesis led to a kind of historiographic isolationism, for historians continued to dwell upon this continental theme at a time when it became increasingly clear that we must understand our past as a part of the history of Western civilization at large. The critics who voiced these objections tended to reject the frontier thesis altogether.

In a book which is probably the most striking and effective reaffirmation of the frontier doctrine since Turner, Walter P. Webb has cut free from both the restrictive Americanism and the restrictive agrarianism of Turner, and has proposed a bold and sweeping theory of modern history. *The Great Frontier* advances the thesis that we are now ending a single historical phase that began with the Age of Discovery. This Age opened up a world frontier which was "inherently a vast body of wealth without proprietors." By doing so, it precipitated a "sudden, continuing, and ever-increasing flood of wealth" upon the centers of Western civilization, thus inaugurating a period of boom which lasted about four hundred years and during which all of the institutions of Western man—economic, political, and social—were transformed in adjustment to the needs of a world in boom. With the end of this supply of undeveloped resources, modern man now faces frightful difficulties of adjustment.

In his recognition of the extremely varied forms of wealth which the natural resources of the new continents presented to mankind, Webb everlastingly breaks the false link between agrarian thought and frontier doctrine. In his emphasis upon the global character of the Great Frontier, he forever divorces the frontier thesis from narrow nationalism. By the originality and freshness of his approach, and by his talent for viewing developments in the large, he gives historians everywhere something worth chewing upon.

But, in my opinion, Professor Webb has greatly weakened the validity of his thesis by his disregard of technology as a factor and his acceptance of geographical determinism as the sole key to modern history. Granted the great importance of the frontier as a locus of wealth, it does not necessarily follow that the frontier is the *only* significant source of modern wealth. Webb asserts that "it was the constant distribution on a nominal or free basis of the royal or public domain that kept the boom going and that gave a peculiar dynamic quality to Western Civilization for four centuries," and his discussion is pervaded with dark forebodings for the future of a world which no longer commands such a stock of untapped resources. In short, he commits himself to an unsophisticated form of geographical determinism, and he apparently does this somewhat innocently, without having taken into consideration the writings of James C. Malin, Isaiah Bowman, and others who have analyzed the pitfalls of this concept.

It would, of course, be absurd to deny the vital role of natural resources as a basis for our present supply of goods of all kinds. But resources alone do not bring about the supply of goods, for primitive peoples with bare subsistence standards have possessed the same resources for as much as fifty thousand years. Wealth depends also upon our ability to convert resources into a socially useful form—that is upon productive capacity. Our productive capacity, in turn, depends not only on the raw materials which are ready to hand, but even more upon our ability to increase, through technology, the volume of goods which can be turned out by each worker. For instance, free land was wonderful, but it could never, by itself, have freed us from the condition in which more than 70% of our labor force was required to produce the food needed by our people. But when technology enabled 11% of our labor force to produce food for all, it freed nearly 60% for other productive activities.

In practice, of course, the forces of technology and environment constantly interplay, and cannot be isolated. Because they do interplay, it might be argued that the abundance of resources on the Great Frontier has stimulated the technology—that the spectacle of vast riches waiting to be grasped has inspired men to devise new means for grasping them—and that in this sense, the Great Frontier brought into being the new technology. But it is a stubborn fact that the technological revolution seemed to precede the Age of Discovery. From the time of the Crusades, four centuries before Columbus and da Gama, Western Europe was in transition. The use of gunpowder, the art of printing, improvements in navigation, the revival of commerce, the whole pervasive change known as the Renaissance—all these had paved the way not only for the great geographical discoveries but also for the industrial transformation of Europe. Viewing the matter in this way, it might be argued that what really happened was that an advancing technology opened up a whole new range of potentialities, including the physical resources of the New World—rather than that the epic geographical discoveries precipitated a technological revolution.

This is not meant to imply that the environmental factor should be relegated to a secondary position. It is not my purpose to assert either that technology can operate without materials, or that Webb's Malthusian misgivings for the future are unjustified. But precisely because the factors which he deals with are of capital significance, it is important that they should not become identified with doctrines of geographical determinism. When he attacks, to such good effect, the glib and over-worked "Fallacy of New Frontiers," it is unfortunate that he goes on to claim that "Science . . . is not likely . . . to make the [world] we have much better than it is"—something which science has done repeatedly in the past and which, if not perverted to the uses of war, it is eminently likely to do in the future. In short, it is unfortunate that the time-worn fallacies of geographical determinism should have crept into a work with so many original and striking insights. For Professor Webb's formulation is one of the first fully-developed treatments of a major aspect of modern world history, and even those who may criticize his theory will find that his book is one of the rare volumes which force the reader to re-examine his historical assumptions, to re-cast his historical thought, and to recognize clearly great historical patterns which, because of their very magnitude, he had never previously perceived as a whole.

DAVID M. POTTER.

Yale University.

The Zone of Indifference. BY ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPÉ. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1952. Pp. 312. $3.75.)

The prevailing sense of political crisis has led many recent writers to consult the history of past civilizations for guidance in the present. To some extent the present work falls within this familiar category. Believing that the crucial issue of contemporary policy is the problem of maintaining effective cooperation between the United States and Western Europe, and that the principal threat to Western culture is the impending breakdown of communication between these two vital areas, the author has tried to throw light on these matters by examining the ways whereby the integrity of cultures has been maintained in the past, and the circumstances attending their disintegration. The alienation of Byzantium from Rome, which destroyed the cultural unity of the Roman Empire and crippled its capacity for self-defense, is repeatedly mentioned as the classic parallel to the contemporary situation. Wisely recognizing, however, that "history repeats a timeless score, but not itself" (p. 27), the author refrains from spelling out this analogy in any detail, but turns rather to an analysis of the meaning of culture in general, and of the sociological and psychological processes which maintain cultures both in sickness and in health. His purpose in so doing is to establish criteria of cultural health against which to measure the forces of disintegration in our own particular culture.

This preliminary part of the work is not especially novel. Although the author reserves his warmest praise for Spengler, his own position is rather closer to that of Toynbee. Rejecting any sort of pseudo-biological determinism, he also adopts an essentially psychological and moralistic interpretation of history. "Men are linked to each other through meaning and purpose" (p. 15). "Culture is vital belief" (p. 60). As long as men share in a single "Social Mind," they are members of a common culture, and will devote themselves to its defense. But there is always a possibility that they will lose confidence in the vital beliefs of the culture in which they have been bred. This "alienation of the Social Mind," when carried beyond a certain point, leads to disintegration and death. The problem of alienation is, therefore, the crucial element in the history of all human cultures. To anyone familiar with the general position of Toynbee, all this will be fairly familiar.

The real meat of the book consists, however, not in the elaboration of these general concepts, but in their application to the specific problems of contemporary foreign policy. This the author proceeds to do with a good deal of originality and insight.

According to Strausz-Hupé, the origins of Western culture are to be located in the 15th century, when the fall of Constantinople finally severed the ties between Eastern and Western Europe, and forced the West into that sudden career of overseas expansion which was to delimit its future field of action. This coincided with the intellectual movements of the Renaissance and Reformation, which broke the crust of traditional society, and established the typical vital belief of Western man. The core of this belief, nourished by the converging influences of Greek intellectualism, Roman legalism, and Christian conscience, was individualism. In social life this found expression in the concept of the self-directed man, a person whose life-course was governed not by the inherited status of traditional society or by the external fiat of tyranny, but by self-imposed criteria of action. In politics it led to the concept of the sovereign state as the indispensable defender of cultural values, and to the ideal of an international order based on balance of powers and contractual freedom rather than on organized authority. Such were the vital beliefs which gave Western culture its unique expansive power, and enabled the Western world for centuries to dominate the alien and perennially hostile forces of the East.

How then did the present crisis arise? The Western empires in Asia are in full retreat, and a hostile Russia, heir to the estrangement of Byzantium, threatens momentarily to overwhelm a divided and apathetic Europe. Is this shift in the balance of world power a result of purely external forces? Or is the weakness of the Western world internal and self-imposed?

The latter is the proposition defended in the present book. While admitting that the external position has in fact deteriorated, the author believes that the preponderance of material strength is still overwhelmingly favorable to the West. The difficulty arises from an alienation of the Social Mind which is making it increasingly difficult for America and Europe to pool their efforts in any joint endeavor.

Strausz-Hupé's thesis, and this is the most interesting and controversial feature of his work, is that the current obstacles to communication arise from the fact that America is now the true bearer of Western culture, while Europe has become largely alienated from it. The United States was founded in the 18th century, at a time when post-Renaissance optimism was at its height, and in a country where there were few vestiges of traditional society to impede the realization of Western ideals. This enabled the United States to pass through the changing conditions of 19th-century life with unimpaired faith in individualism. America "supplied the one positive answer given in the nineteenth century" to the problem of modern industrialism, by creating "an industrial society that was free and classless" (p. 163). In Europe, on the contrary, the forces of liberalism were never strong enough to gain the total allegiance of society. The remnants of traditional society, retreating for protection into the arms of an ever more powerful state bureaucracy, were able to prevent any comparable development in that part of the world. The turning point came in 1848, when the last great attempt to rally the European masses behind the ideal of liberal nationalism went down to defeat. The result was a profound and lasting alienation of the European proletariat. The vital belief of Western culture, which still unites America, has been increasingly unable to arouse the energies of a united

Europe. The spectre of total alienation, and of the final severing of Western culture, is at hand.

Under these circumstances, the primary duty of the United States is clear: it is to lend the weight of its moral leadership to the reestablishment of the unity of Western culture. American military and economic power is, at the present time, the only force capable of defending this culture against the dangers of Eastern encroachment. But this power is culturally significant only insofar as it may provide a last opportunity for restoration of the Western consensus. From as far back as the time of Tocqueville, the American political and social experiment, with its unique combination of democratic freedom and national unity, has exerted a powerful influence on the liberal thought of Europe. Although recent developments in the United States as elsewhere have tended to diminish the individual's capacity for self-determination, especially in economic affairs, the Western ideal of individualism is by no means spent. If the liberal forces of Europe and America continue to share and to work toward the realization of this ideal, Western culture may still be saved from disintegration. But if the "Western dialogue" ends, and the two halves of the Western world no longer continue, as in the past, to fortify one another by the exchange of vital ideas and experiments, all will be over. Although American military power may well prevent Western Europe in any case from being overrun by the East, this can, in the absence of a true consensus, be achieved only through the establishment of an American Empire which, no matter how benevolent, will spell the death of Western culture. Since this is the last thing America wants, it follows that American policy should be directed toward the encouragement of democratic leadership in Western Europe, and that the build-up of purely military power should be subordinated to this objective. This is the essential message of the book.

Altogether this should be reckoned as one of the more useful and stimulating of the recent contributions to the literature of international politics. Its prime virtue is to emphasize, as against the isolationist tendencies operating on both sides of the Atlantic, the fact that close relations between America and Europe are not merely a question of temporary military convenience, but of long-range cultural needs. Like all books which cover an enormous territory in a few pages, it abounds in generalizations which, as the author himself points out, are far too sweeping, particularly in such ticklish matters as the identification of "national character." Despite the evidence of Tocqueville and others, moreover, the reviewer is by no means convinced that the American experiment has ever had so great a power of attraction as the author thinks. The reviewer also believes that the book tends, in its emphasis on the role of ideas in history, to underestimate the power of other factors. In view of the demonstrated destructive and coercive powers of the modern police state, which Strausz-Hupé himself recognizes as a powerful agency of moral disintegration, is it really possible to be sure, for example, that the establishment of a free and productive society in Western Europe would "exert an irresistible pull upon the peoples of Eastern

Europe" (p. 298), and thus threaten the hold of Russia on that region? But these are matters of opinion, and the opinions set forth in the present work are clearly worth considering.

FREDERICK M. WATKINS.

Yale University.

Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia. BY GEORGE MCTURNAN KAHIN. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1952. Pp. xii, 490. $6.00.)

Indonesia's road to independence was not an easy one. It came as the result of a world war, long hostile occupation, and finally revolution, with United Nations intervention. The Indonesian, like the revolutions in other Asian countries, was not simply a struggle for national political independence. It contained other elements, such as revolt against poverty and misery, and against domination of the West, whether politically, economically or culturally. In many respects it is a continuing revolution. To attempt an analysis of one of the contemporary Asian revolutions, especially when the setting is as complicated as was that of Indonesia, is no simple task.

Dr. Kahin has given us a detailed story of Indonesia's road to independence. He brought to his task unusual qualifications. He spent several years in intensive study and research in Indonesian history and politics. He acquired a mastery of Dutch and Indonesian languages and read widely in the rich Dutch literature on Indonesia. After several years of preparation he had the good fortune to be in Indonesia during the last year of the revolution. He made the acquaintance of a large number of the Indonesian leaders. Kahin saw an important phase of the revolution at first hand, and to a remarkable degree from the inside. His account of the revolution will long remain a unique and important source of information about its leaders, the course of events and their relationship to one another.

In his discussion of the social environment of Indonesian nationalism, Kahin challenges what he calls the frequently made observation that during their long rule in the Indies the Dutch followed a policy of maintaining the existing structure of native society and that the basic characteristics of that society remained virtually unchanged. He, on the contrary, holds that during the three centuries of Dutch rule the moderately authoritarian Javanese society became "generally strongly authoritarian in character." This is in part setting up a straw man and then knocking it down. Those who have made the observation which he attacks certainly never meant to convey the idea that no changes took place in Indonesian society under Dutch rule. No society in modern times has been hermetically sealed or placed in refrigeration, or can be. It was Dutch policy to protect and preserve native culture and institutions as much as possible, or as J. S. Furnivall put it, to conserve "the influence of custom." This has nothing to do with the question of whether the policy was good or bad. The present reviewer is inclined to conclude that the policy was unwise and in the end productive of more evil than good; but Furnivall, in his *Colonial*

Policy and Practice, which is a comparative study of British and Dutch policy in Burma and the East Indies respectively, has many good things to say about the Dutch policy, and he certainly is no apologist for colonialism. Since Java, to say nothing of the East Indies as a whole, was politically unintegrated when the Dutch began to impose their rule, central authority had to be created and strengthened. If that had not been done there would not be an Indonesian nation today. Would the government have been any less "authoritarian" if the Dutch had not strengthened the personal authority of the native elite, but had imposed direct rule upon the whole area? It is difficult to conceive of a colonial regime which is not authoritarian.

It cannot be said that Dr. Kahin has given a consistent and valid picture of the forces which produced the revolution. For example, at one point one gets the impression that a strong factor was the deliberate policy of the Dutch in withholding education from Indonesians, but later it appears that Western education, by creating a new elite, had provided the movement with impetus and leadership. Mr. Kahin seems to feel that he must find a justification for, or at least an explanation of, the revolution in the evils of Dutch rule. The nationalist movement developed not because of the defects or even vices of the Dutch administration, of which there were many, but because on the whole it promoted conditions which made possible the development of Indonesian leaders. The desire for national independence is so natural that it does not have to be accounted for or justified by marshalling a series of injustices. Grievances against foreign rulers are quite naturally exaggerated and are felt more keenly than worse evils imposed by a national government. This is very understandable, but the detached student should be able to see all this in its proper perspective.

This is not the most objective book ever written. Mr. Kahin's very natural sympathy with the Indonesian cause is obvious in many pages of his book. Unfortunately, this sympathy frequently leads him to make superficial statements and unsound judgments. In his discussion of Darul Islam he states (p. 331) that "the Dutch were unable to suppress or even contain the growth of Darul Islam," which is undoubtedly true; but he was much impressed with the view of numerous Pasundan officials that only "Republican troops would be able to suppress the Darul Islam." The situation was not as simple as that. The Indonesian troops after three years of effort have not yet succeeded in doing it. The abolition of the federal system only six months after the transfer of sovereignty and the institution of a unitary system before the adoption of a permanent constitution was not a statesmanlike performance. Precious time was lost in making the transition. For months, and that at a critical time, the government was practically at a standstill. Kahin, however, gives it complete justification. The last chapter, on achievements and prospects, contains much excellent analysis but suffers from being somewhat uncritical.

AMRY VANDENBOSCH.

University of Kentucky.

The Community of the Future. By Fr. Vinding Kruse. (New York: The Philosophical Library. 1952. Pp. vii, 828. $12.00.)

The intellectual world owes a debt of gratitude to the translators of this huge volume for having made the rich harvest of thought of a prominent Danish professor of jurisprudence accessible to English-speaking readers. The theses propounded in the book are provocative and often unorthodox; but even readers who reject Dr. Kruse's social philosophy will find it worth their time to study his penetrating analysis of the entire realm of political, economic, and legal relations and his detailed proposals for improving the social order.

The main theme is that man, in order to survive under the threat of ruthless wars and barbarism from without and moral decay from within, must rise above the quest for material values, in personal life as well as in the life of nations, must strive to overcome his predatory propensities, and must develop a new, unselfish type whose deepest satisfaction is derived from spiritual, moral, and esthetic values. Dr. Kruse believes that the choices implicit in this definition of the ultimate goal do not necessarily depend upon the acceptance of some religious belief, but may be based upon premises and axioms which are scientifically provable. In his opinion, the experiences of thousands of years have shown that no solid and lasting foundations for a social order can be built without moral self-control, consideration for others, justice, and productive cooperation in realizing the great aims of civilization. He foresees an eventual renaissance of those ethical ideals which are common to all influential world religions and which social science can demonstrate to be the most *practical* principles for administering human affairs.

Dr. Kruse's approach to the problem of social control prescribes tasks for social science which are commonly believed to be outside of its proper province. In his view, science need not limit itself to a descriptive analysis of observable facts, but may legitimately extend the scope of its inquiry into the realm of the "ought." He is convinced that the truth or untruth of ethical axioms can be verified by objective historical research and scientific proof. He develops a rather strong case for the proposition that the social experiences of centuries of human effort can furnish us with many insights that are of lasting value in our attempt to find the guiding principles of social regulation. Just as the applied natural sciences teach us that we *must* close a circuit if we want the benefit of light, that we *must* use a certain type of construction to produce a certain bridge, that we *must* use insulin to combat certain diseases, so social experience teaches that men *must*, for example, show industry and self-control to earn a living and to obtain technical progress. Dr. Kruse maintains that, by using scientific methods, ethics can be developed into a spiritual medical science which complements the treatment of the body by physical medical science by an experimental treatment of the human soul. He also believes that jurisprudence is capable of becoming a science of proper lawmaking once the indispensable goals of the legal order have been ascertained by the social scientists.

With these methodological premises, Dr. Kruse undertakes to outline a comprehensive system of man's rights, duties, and responsibilities in a new community. Practically no field of life is neglected by the author in his ambitious endeavor to ascertain the principles most conducive to the promotion of justice and the general welfare in a modern commonwealth. He discusses the personal rights of man, the law of the family and of inheritance, the right of physical and intellectual property, the right to earn, the organization of labor and capital, agriculture, architecture, town planning, and the preservation of the beauty of nature. In each of these fields he presents us with concrete proposals for the improvement of the law.

In the final chapter the author discusses the political constitution for a new community. Pointing out the shortcomings of traditional democracy as well as the dangers and pitfalls of autocratic rule, the author advocates a third solution which would introduce into political life an element of "expert rule" and guidance by an intellectual elite, but which would at the same time preserve the freedom of the spirit, the fundamental rights of men, and the supremacy of the law. The inherent faults of democracy, he points out, have since the time of the Greek republics led to endless alternations between democratic rule and dictatorship. Dictatorship provides no cure, since it stifles the energies of free people and by abuse of concentrated power is likely to reduce the masses of the people to a condition akin to slavery. Dr. Kruse's plan for solving this political dilemma of our epoch is a revision of the electoral system under which the political representatives of the nation would be chosen by professional associations, industrial and trade organizations, and institutions of research and learning, rather than by the populace as a whole. He believes that this system will bring about an "enlightened democracy" in which vocational groups will elect to political office those whom they know to be qualified and experienced.

It is not possible, within the scope of this review, to mention more than a small fraction of the political, economic, and legal problems for which Dr. Kruse proposes definite and often bold solutions. Some of his recommendations may be very difficult of realization; others would require thorough study in the light of the experiences of various nations. But whatever one may think of the merit of individual proposals of the author, all of his ideas are the product of thorough analysis and high-minded, earnest purpose, and they should be neither ignored nor lightly treated by those who, in theory or in practice, are concerned with the advancement of human welfare.

EDGAR BODENHEIMER.

University of Utah.

Federal Administrative Law. BY RINEHART JOHN SWENSON. (New York: The Ronald Press Company. 1952. Pp. v, 376. $6.00.)

The ten subtitles of this book will themselves suggest to the reader that the author's "administrative law" is a subdivision of constitutional law rather than an aspect of administration. Thus, after a brief introductory chapter entitled

"From Laissez Faire to Bureaucracy" and a second chapter discussing "The Place of Administration in the Constitutional Trichotomy," the headings are as follows: "The Administrative Process," "Enforcement of Administrative Action," "The Rule of Law: The Doctrine of State Immunity," "The Rule of Law: The Liability of Public Officers," "Judicial Processing of Administrative Action," "Limitations of Judicial Control of the Administrative Process," "Government by Agency or Government by Lawsuit," "Congressional Supervision of the Federal Administrative Process."

This emphasis upon what the courts have said about the scope of permissible administrative discretion (to the exclusion of the rules made in the exercise of that discretion) is certainly unexceptionable—provided it is the result of a deliberate choice of perspective the significance of which is duly appreciated. It is Professor Swenson's failure to mention the alternative approach—indeed, his failure to come to grips with the problem of basic definition at all, which sets the distinctly non-philosophic tone of the work.

No doubt this may have been intentional. The author has done such an admirable job of documenting judicial commentary on all the subjects mentioned above that he is entitled to classify himself as a member of the "law and no nonsense" school of writers who consciously sacrifice imagination to industry in their pursuit of the legal muse. Nor is this simply to "praise with faint damns" since Professor Swenson's appraisal of judicial exegesis frequently betrays a lively sense of humor. For example, along with a nice appreciation of the ambiguities of separation of powers dialectic, he expresses a commendable impatience with the solemn nonsense of certain notable attempts to reconcile the inconsistencies of the doctrine. One might wish even here, however, for a little more historical perspective, for this might have suggested an explanation for the bankruptcy of doctrinaire separation of powers theory without smothering sympathy for the practical end the theory still serves. As a matter of fact, it is this sturdy unwillingness to probe below the level of what may be called the "administrative logic" of such formulations that is calculated to make a student of theory continually uneasy throughout the book.

To be sure, this does not purport to be a book on theory. Yet, in the case of one who has adopted the external, constitutional law approach to administration, it is not unreasonable to look for evidence of awareness of institutional patterns transcending the process of policy making and execution. But Professor Swenson is sometimes incorrigibly dogmatic. On page 234 he devotes a short paragraph to the underlying significance of judicial review, the burden of which is that "Judicial review of administrative action should not be regarded as a form of 'control' but rather as a step in an integrated process of common achievement, the administration of justice."

No one would, I think, begrudge Professor Swenson this comfortably monistic conclusion if he had come to it after assessing some of the traditional dichotomies of our constitutionalism and found them wanting; or, perhaps, if he had made it clear that he was discussing only *one* of the functions expected of courts under our system. As it is, however, one is left with the suspicion that the author does not appreciate that some of the old dualism is still very much alive despite the formal coordination supplied by the modern legislative function.

And if this *is* the case it does much to explain the summary fashion in which he disposes of judicial remarks which do not fit into a monistic pattern. For example, Chief Justice Hughes is taken rather sharply to task for his disposition of *Norman* v. *Baltimore* and *Perry* v. *U. S.* Professor Swenson observes (p. 158) that Hughes' conception of a right without a remedy is "strange doctrine," and he reminds the Chief Justice that the immunity of the United States from suit is a "basic attribute of sovereignty" and not a matter of procedure as the latter described it.

Most students of constitutional law will, of course, agree that Hughes is somewhat less than convincing in the *Gold Clause* cases. But very few will find the notion of a right without a remedy by action utterly strange—even on purely analytical grounds. Moreover, a characterization of the immunity doctrine as a matter of procedure is at least as palatable as its attribution to the logic of sovereignty when we consider (a) that the former proposition is historically quite accurate, and (b) that it is the manipulation of sovereignty by the judges rather than the logic of sovereignty which helps to explain the contemporary posture of suits against the state. Thus, the logic of sovereignty can hardly explain why Congress *is* the sovereign for purposes of consenting to suit, but definitely *not* the sovereign for most other purposes. Professor Swenson might reflect that the availability of injunction to prevent the collection of federal taxes does not depend on the acquiescence of Congress—from which it may be inferred that the logic of sovereignty is not inexorable.

K. C. Cole.

University of Washington.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, 1945–1950. By Robert K. Carr. (New York: Cornell University Press. 1952. Pp. xiii, 489. $6.50.)

Professor Carr's premise is that "a small, highly disciplined group of American Communists, cooperating closely with the international Communist conspiracy, can do grave damage to this country. But the damage they can do is not the subversion of the American people; it is the damage that criminals can do . . . espionage and sabotage." His conclusions are that: "On balance the good things that the Un-American Activities Committee has done are outweighed by the bad . . . the wisest policy to follow would be the complete abolition of the committee."

Even if he does not agree fully with either premises or conclusions or what lies between them, anyone who reads the book objectively will agree that the author has written it objectively. That alone is no easy task and no small accomplishment for any writer on this subject. After a brief chapter on the origins of the Committee, four long chapters evaluate its work in the 79th, 80th and 81st Congresses. Each major hearing and some reports are described. It is an excellent condensation, for it does not lose the flavor.

Two chapters on personnel and staff give thumbnail sketches of prominent members of the Committee. The Congressmen are graded on both ability and deportment. In general they are rated a low C on ability (Mr. Nixon gets an A−). In deportment the failures are obvious. Most valuable in these chapters and in the one on investigations is a detailed account of the files, the organization, and the undramatic daily activities in the backroom that support the brief, frenetic, and sensational hearing days. In a chapter on the Committee's publications Professor Carr finds them gravely below acceptable standards.

The precise summary of the courts' treatment of cases arising out of the Committee's activities and of the constitutional issues involved is excellent. The author concludes that the courts have shown wisdom in leaving the Committee unfettered so far. Judicial restraint is in this matter considered sounder than judicial restraints.

A chapter on press coverage of the Committee, though not exhaustive, is thought-provoking. Even good newspapers with thoughtful editorials about the Committee, the author finds, tended to present confused, sensational, and superficial accounts of the Committee's doings in their news columns.

In all, this study of a highly important and highly controversial subject is, in its thorough exposition of the facts and in the calm and care which pervade its judgments, an example of scholarship at its best. Yet when this is said—and it should be said emphatically—something remains, if it can be said without seeming to tax the author with not writing a book he did not set out to write. There is, to this reviewer (who probably voices a minority opinion), a certain air of unreality about much of the scholarly discussion of the broader problem of loyalty and subversion with which this book is concerned.

Professor Carr's words all too probably will reach the ears of only a rather small group of people who will find in them confirmation of their own more casual conclusions. For them the book's very excellence may be its vice. For there are many others, apparently millions, who would not be convinced by his words even if they heard them. And why would they not? Because they feel, unlike the author, that there is a danger of "the subversion of the American people." Those who see no such danger face a great temptation: that is to regard the belief that such a danger exists as a great aberration, and to conclude that they can only denounce it or deplore it.

Instead, is it not the responsibility of social scientists, whatever the causes of these widespread fears of subversion may be, to explore them? Without adequate diagnosis, prescription is uncertain and prognosis unencouraging. But are we giving enough attention to the diagnosis? Perhaps Professor Cushman, the general editor of this series, will do so in his promised summary volume. Perhaps the recipients of the large grant from the Ford Foundation recently announced will do so. Someone should.

ROBERT A. HORN.

Stanford University.

Nature and Needs of Higher Education: The Report of the Commission on Financing Higher Education. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1952. Pp. xi, 191. $2.50.)

Who Should Go to College. By Byron S. Hollinshead with a chapter by Robert Havighurst and Robert R. Rodgers. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1952. Pp. xi, 190. $3.00.)

The Federal Government and Financing Higher Education. By Richard G. Axt. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1952. Pp. xiv, 295. $4.00.)

Government Assistance to Universities in Great Britain: Memoranda Submitted to the Commission on Financing Higher Education. By Harold W. Dodds, Louis M. Hacker and Lindsay Rogers. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1952. Pp. x, 133. $2.50.)

State Public Finance and State Institutions of Higher Education in the United States. By H. K. Allen in collaboration with Richard G. Axt. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1952. Pp. xviii, 196. $3.00.)

Student Charges and Financing of Higher Education. By Richard H. Ostheimer. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1953).

The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States. By Richard Hofstadter and D. DeWitt Hardy. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1952. Pp. ix, 254. $3.00.)

A Statistical Analysis of the Organization of Higher Education in the United States, 1948–1949. By Richard H. Ostheimer. (New York: Columbia University Press. Pp. xviii, 233.)

Financing Higher Education in the United States: The Staff Report of the Commission on Financing Higher Education. By John D. Millett. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1952. Pp. xix, 503. $5.00.)

All of us in the academic world are, of course, vitally aware of the problem of financing higher education. The problem of keeping afloat in the contemporary inflationary economy is equally difficult for the administrator who has to meet an academic payroll and for the professor who has to meet a family payroll. Accordingly the thoughts on this problem of a study commission sponsored by the Association of American Universities and including some leading industrialists and educators are very welcome. The report is doubly welcome because the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundation grants made it possible to produce a number of interesting supporting monographs. We political scientists can be pleased that one of our number, John D. Millett, served as executive director of the Commission and has himself written the most substantial volume.

In some ways the report of the Commission is less fruitful than the supporting monographs. This is probably because of the difficulty of dealing with the problems of American higher education in a 200 page report. As the Commission itself remarks, our higher education is easily the most diverse in the world. Fruitful generalizations about it thus become very difficult to make. Nevertheless, the report of the Commission contains some food for thought. It begins with an excellent review of higher education in the United States which is, of course, familiar material to most of us academic folk but may be very valuable to persons outside the higher educational system. It may be news even to professors that "one-fifth of all American youth goes to college." This is proportionately five times as many as in England, six or seven times as many as in Germany, and ten times as many as in France.

The Commission also illustrates the diversity of American education with some statistics which may be new to some professors. Slightly over half of our 2,250,000 students in 1948–1949 were enrolled in universities. Slightly less than one-quarter were in liberal arts colleges. The balance was split between professional schools and junior colleges. The report also indicates that these 2,250,000 are not enough. It takes the figures of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training which indicate that only about one-half of the young persons who rank high in terms of intellectual promise (as measured by intelligence tests) actually go to college. In fact one-fifth of the top 500,000 young people in these terms never finish high school.

The reviewer has some doubts as to the validity of this analysis. It has been his observation, both in the competition of college and subsequent careers, that intelligence as measured by standardized tests is far from being the major criterion of an individual's worth. He wonders if the addition to our colleges of 200,000 or 300,000 bright young people who do not really want to go to college would improve our academic standards or the leadership of the nation. Clearly, the point is disputable. It seems unfortunate, however, that the Commission did not, in its report, refer to the qualification introduced by Mr. Hollinshead in his book published for the Commission that an inquiry made by Mr. Roper for the American Council on Education shows that one-third of the high school graduates of top intelligence who did not go to college would not wish to go even if they were given generous scholarships. The reviewer's argument is not with the assumption of the Commission that more people should go to college. Certainly, American industry is able to absorb even more college graduates than we are now producing. The reviewer's only question is whether brightness as measured by intelligence tests is the real criterion for selecting college-worthy students.

The Commission next addresses itself to the economic problems of higher education. The major difficulties which higher education has encountered are, of course, familiar to most of us. They include: (1) inflation, which has reduced the purchasing power of the educational dollar; (2) expansion of educational services demanded by the increased complexity of our knowledge; (3) fluctuation of student enrollments caused by changes in military demands; (4) needs for enlarged and modernized capital plant; and (5) uncertain sources of income.

The first point is illustrated by a problem which is all too familiar to most of us. Faculty salaries rose from 40% to 60% in a period when the consumers price index went up over 80%. Private colleges have been especially unable to meet this rise in living costs. In its discussion of the expanded services rendered by colleges and universities, the Commission pays particular attention to expanded research, especially governmental research. It concludes that universities should be careful about taking on such projects and that sponsoring agencies should pay the full costs of the projects and be more flexible in their policies. In its discussion of the problem of fluctuating enrollment, the major conclusion of the Commission is the need for a national manpower policy so that the waves of students going through colleges and universities can be evened out.

In discussing the need for enlarged plant, the Commission pays especial attention to medical education and to the general problem of handling medical schools. The major conclusion is, of course, the necessity of increased income. The same conclusion is also reached in the discussion of the plight of the liberal arts colleges. The latter are criticized on the score of the extravagance of their curriculum. The comment of the reviewer as administrator of a liberal arts college is that these criticisms are not sufficiently far-reaching. Our liberal arts colleges have not only made the mistake of trying to imitate universities in the extension of their program, but they have also tried to take on more studdents than their endowment would justify.

The Commission then turns its attention to the sources of support of higher education. It notes the greatly increased importance of tuition, which in 1950 represented 47% of private university income, 72% of liberal arts college income, and 46% of separate professional school income. The proportion of income of public institutions from tuition has also risen substantially—from 22% in 1930 to 31% in 1950. The Commission notes that large private universities in urban centers frequently compete successfully with state universities because their high tuition charge is balanced by the cost of room and board in state universities, which are usually located in towns more remote from centers of population. It does not go on to indicate the danger facing such large private universities as more and more state institutions are established in large urban areas. By and large the Commission does not seem to feel that tuition has risen more than the ability of families to pay. It does note, however, that high tuition fees are damaging to families like those of clergymen and teachers.

The Commission places well-merited stress on endowment. This is a desirable point which many colleges have been somewhat overlooking in the rush for annual giving and concern about lower rates of endowment income. The Commission quite properly notes that the record of security and of return on endowment funds held by colleges and universities, both private and state supported, has been so excellent over the past century that the faith of earlier donors on endowment has been justified. This reviewer would like to add to the Commission's encomiums on endowment the additional point that private colleges and universities would, in most cases, be much better off if they had not let the size of their student body run ahead of their endowment. Colleges can no more afford to run ahead of their endowments than generals can afford to run ahead of their troops.

In its discussion of state governmental support, the Commission notes that heavy demands for welfare services are now assailing the states. This conclusion could have been supported by an interesting point to be found in one of its own subsidiary reports: that the percentage of state income going to higher education is much less now than it was two decades ago. The Commission considers the possibility of state aid to students in either public or private institutions but waters down its recommendation by saying: "obviously no such program should be set up in competition with the direct operating needs of state institutions of higher education." It was somewhat disappointing to the reviewer to note that the Commission failed to recognize at this crucial point in its report the desirability of maintaining at least some strong private institutions in most of the states.

The Commission discusses federal aid to education carefully and states its belief that present federally supported research programs have been very useful. It concludes, however, that it would be unwise to have the federal government moving further into the support of our higher education, justifying its position on the danger of the location of too much power in the federal government and the uniformity and mediocrity which would result from direct federal control. This conclusion is partially supported by indirect evidence from a study on higher education from Great Britain. Political scientists can applaud the Commission's careful consideration of this important problem.

The Commission also recommends the strengthening and continuation of giving by alumni and of corporate support, which it illustrates with several examples. It also speaks of church support and labor union support. Perhaps the strongest comment it makes is with regard to American foundations which now may run as high as three thousand in number with total assets of several billion dollars. The Commission quite properly notes with regret that foundations have practically eliminated liberal arts colleges from their support and tend to make their grants to universities only for temporary projects. If foundations would give some of their support on a matching basis to colleges for endowment, they would perform a much more useful function for the preservation of the essentials of liberal education in America than they are now performing with their miscellaneous research grants.

One of the more interesting of the several supporting volumes discusses potential college student bodies. *Who Should Go To College* documents with figures the fact that colleges attract only two-fifths of the top 25% of young people, measured in terms of intelligence tests. Mr. Hollinshead notes the irrational factors on which students go to college. He cites a rough estimate that "half of the present student body of the average college is in that particular college because of influence of relatives or friends of its constituency." He casts some doubt on the financial difficulties of going to college, noting not only the Roper inquiry referred to above, but also the fact that student enrollment increased steadily during depression years. He concludes that perhaps half of those in the top quarter in intelligence who do not go to college would go if they were financed. He guesses an average need of $500 per student for financing and thus estimates that a sum of around $226,000,000 would enable those of the able group who might be persuaded to go to college to do so. He comments that this cost would be equal to that of only one and a half days of the cold war. However, he has nothing to say on the all-important problem of whether all of these young folks who could be induced to go to college would study after they got there.

In discussing the implications of the suggestion of student subsidy, Hollinshead notes quite reasonably that college policy in scholarships is frequently one of competing for "the glamorous youngsters" and not looking beneath the surface for unnoticed talents. He advocates a national scholarship program administered through the U. S. Office of Education and committees established by regional associations. This thought is based on the, to the reviewer, naive assumption that the government could make such grants without maintaining control.

An interesting chapter by Havighurst and Rodgers of the University of Chicago discusses motivations for "superior" youth who do not go to college. The conclusion is that improved guidance procedures, community scholarship associations, and better motivating procedures on college campuses would be helpful.

Richard G. Axt's careful study of the role of the federal government in financing higher education begins by commenting that federal aid is like higher education in America: i.e., large and diverse. It is noted that federal activities in higher education are all peripheral to higher education itself. The federal government uses higher educational institutions for its own purposes. The writer generalizes, probably correctly, that if and when government control of higher education comes in the United States, it is more likely to come from state governments than the federal government. A review of the Morrill Act notes that it, along with the Dartmouth College case, gave great impetus to state educational institutions. The results of the Morrill Act are fully and thoughtfully outlined. It is interesting to learn that the Second Morrill Bill was for a time combined with thoughts of federal aid to public school systems. Of course, the Second Morrill Act of 1890 as finally passed had great influence on the subjects taught in land grant institutions.

In discussing federal research, Axt points out that almost all of it has been concentrated in a few large universities. The Atomic Energy Commission's research has been more or less in pure science. The Army and Air Force research seems, by general agreement of university administrators, to be most closely supervised and hence the most difficult to handle. An interesting point is made that there is far more federal research outside of universities than in universities. It is hoped that the National Science Foundation can develop better procedures for research control.

Axt also has a lengthy and careful study of the G. I. Bill of Rights, including the double payment made to land grant institutions in some cases. In discussing grants made for medical research by the Public Health Service, he notes a few cases in which private foundation grants have ceased because of the federal program. Medical schools have favored a bill for direct federal aid, but Axt does not think this is likely to be enacted. He makes a careful review of the

Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. In discussing the federal scholarship program proposed by the Truman Administration, he favors the double stipend for tuition and for room and board in an effort to help support private education. He comes to a general conclusion that the federal government could aid private education by modifying its existing programs with the needs of educational institutions in mind. By and large, Axt's volume is most thoughtful and informed.

The brief study entitled *Government Assistance to Universities in Great Britain* gives much interesting data on British higher education. The conclusion is that the British have tried very hard in administering their grants to keep from controlling universities unduly. Nevertheless there are still some apprehensions in Great Britain, and American students of the British system are careful to point out that the degree of independence in England might not be duplicated in the United States since conditions here are very different. Thus, in a way, the conclusions of both the Axt volume and the Dodds-Hacker-Rogers volume point against reliance on federal aid for pulling higher education out of its difficulties.

State Public Finance and State Institutions of Higher Education in the United States is good reading for professors in state universities. It gives the interesting information that the percentage of state budgets going to higher education shrank from 10% in 1915 to 4% in 1949. This is, of course, a natural result of the greatly increased state expenditure for social welfare and other purposes. The study brings up to date a great deal of information on state expenditures and income. It arrives at the conclusion that state financial problems are likely to remain pressing for some time to come but that "if the public institutions demonstrate with skill and energy their real service to the people of the states, the states will respond to their needs."

Richard H. Ostheimer's *Student Charges and Financing of Higher Education* is written on a statistical basis which makes heavy reading, but the subject is thoughtfully handled. One interesting estimate is that four-fifths of the G. I.'s would have gone to college without the G. I. Bill of Rights. The author, at times, slips into the fallacy that increasing student enrollment improves services to students, forgetting the effect of endowment subsidy. He concludes that enrollment does drop slightly with fee increases but that, by and large, enrollment is also proportioned to income and to the education of the population surrounding the institution. There is some association of enrollment and fee increases by the types of institutions. This volume, when published, will deserve very careful analysis by the institutions which are contemplating fee increases.

The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States is an interesting historical and philosophical review which merits careful reading by all of us. The reviewer found the historical section most interesting. It deals more largely with universities than colleges but does pay some attention to the whole of higher education. It does not bear any particular relationship to the financial problems which are the major study by the Commission except as it assesses the value of the product of higher education. One can be certain that the material in it will be cited and quoted in many articles in the bulletins of the American Association of University Professors and the American Association of Colleges.

A Statistical Analysis of the Organization of Higher Education in the United States, 1948–1949 contains much information of value to those studying educational finance.

The most elaborate supporting volume is John D. Millett's *Financing Higher Education in the United States: The Staff Report of the Commission on Financing Higher Education.* It includes re-studies of most of the problems reviewed in the other specific studies, much material which is not covered in the other studies, and Millett's point of view on both groups of problems. In some ways, it is the most valuable volume of the series. Millett likes to speak *ex-cathedra* and while he makes some mistakes, he makes many more penetrating and thoughtful comments. One proposal with which liberal arts college administrations will almost universally disagree is that of increasing the student-faculty ratio to 18–1. This might work in the eastern states which do not have strong public institutions, but in the west and mid-west, a lower student-faculty ratio is essential to survival of liberal arts colleges. Millett throws out some interesting comments on the need for academic responsibility as a correlation to academic freedom. He recognizes that faculty salaries need to rise at least 30% to catch up with inflation. At another point he notes that athletics is not a revenue yielder except for three or four private universities. He notes that endowment income is really important for only a few educational institutions but that income from endowment has not fallen as much as is generally thought. He notes that gifts are increasing but not as fast as inflation. In general, he thinks that increases in tuition will not decrease enrollment but that colleges should learn more of the sociology of their student bodies before making increases.

GEORGE C. S. BENSON.

Claremont Men's College.

BOOK NOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Veterans in Politics: The Story of the G. A. R. BY MARY R. DEARING. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1952. Pp. x, 523. $6.00.)

"OPA has a deep sense of responsibility toward returned servicemen." These words of Administrator Chester Bowles, as he inaugurated a broad program to assist World War II veterans wishing to enter business, characterized the solicitous attitude of federal agencies months before the war's end. This and the elaborate benefits provided by Congress to aid the ex-GI, under the ever watchful lobbies of the Legion, AMVETS, and other veterans' organizations, contrast markedly with federal policy toward Union soldiers immediately after the Civil War. The Congress did appropriate money to pension war widows, orphans, and the wounded. But neither the federal government nor states made provision even for hospitals for the disabled veteran.

When the economy failed to absorb ex-Union soldiers, veterans' societies sprouted up to seek political remedies. Meanwhile Republicans and Democrats did not overlook the veterans' vote. A Republican party split between conservatives and Radicals in Illinois in 1866 was responsible for producing the G. A. R. The Radical founders needed the soldier vote to cement their control of the Republican party. As the G. A. R. became nationwide, the open alliance with Radical Republicans brought loud Democratic press attacks. To avert possible public ill will, the G. A. R. donned a mask of nonpartisanship. Behind this mask, the organization remained a Republican ally until sectionalism was valueless as political capital. Membership and fortunes fluctuated, but at the height of its power it boasted over 425,000 veterans, and it jammed what amounted to a service pension bill through the Congress. The G. A. R's self-defined nonpartisanship policy, women's auxiliaries, and patriotic programs became the pattern for twentieth-century veterans' groups.

Mrs. Dearing's monograph narrates chronologically the leadership, activities, and political incidents involving the G. A. R.: the metamorphosis from party adjunct to powerful pressure group; its machinations in presidential nominations, election campaigns, and before Congress. The book is a meticulous study based upon exhaustive investigation into manuscript collections, newspapers, and G. A. R. records. It affords much information about the anatomy of this nineteenth-century interest group. But one can only regret that the author rather breathlessly heaps fact upon fact with almost no perspective or interpretation.—VICTORIA SCHUCK, *Mount Holyoke College.*

Champion Campaigner: Franklin D. Roosevelt. BY HAROLD F. GOSNELL. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1952. Pp. viii, 235. $3.50.)

It is entirely plausible that no American political leader will ever receive so much notice as Franklin D. Roosevelt. The volume of comment on his life and works is already beginning to rival that on Lincoln and Jefferson and has probably surpassed that on Wilson and Theodore Roosevelt. This book by Professor Gosnell deserves a high place in Roosevelt literature. Persons familiar with Gosnell's previous work may be surprised at the sober academician's frank admiration for the jovial practitioner of politics. The book reflects Gosnell's scholarly objectivity, as well as his earnest desire to acclaim that which he considers true and noble and of good report.

Though fully aware of the attempts made during the past quarter-century to subject leaders to psychoanalytical scrutiny, Gosnell chooses to strive for an understanding of his subject by appraising his early environment, his associations, his traits, and his techniques in chronological order and in a moderate, commonsense manner. There is in this book none of the incisive, iconoclastic and inspired criticism which Edmund Wilson has recently accorded Lincoln and Laski. This is an orthodox book, sympathetic toward its subject and permeated by a spirit of love of democracy, love of country, and respect for the simple truth.

When Franklin Roosevelt died on April 12, 1945, at the age of sixty-three, he was mourned by millions the world over. What manner of man was this whose passing evoked such strong emotion? And who, also, during his life, was so cordially detested and reviled by his enemies (a fact Gosnell overlooks or dismisses as of little importance)?

Born into a family of moderate wealth, a family which mingled on easy terms with the aristocracy of the Hudson Valley, the titled nobility of Europe, and the leading figures of the professional, financial and official worlds of New York, Boston and Washington, Franklin D. Roosevelt never stood in awe of any one. Only vaguely aware of his own financial and social advantages as obligations of superior force requiring him to devote himself to the interests of "his people," Roosevelt brought to public life a dauntless spirit, a proud devotion to America and its democratic institutions, a sublime self-confidence and poise.

Well-known is the love lavished upon him by his mother. It was a relationship which in other circumstances might have had untoward effects. The young boy might have developed a feeling of hostility toward his father. But, as Gosnell observes, James Roosevelt was fifty-three years old at the time of Franklin's birth, twenty-five years his wife's senior. In his harmonious, serene and secure household, James' position was like that of a benevolent grandfather, a model of rectitude, a wise patriarch and friend.

In this patrician yet deeply religious home, young Roosevelt grew to manhood. He went to the right schools, Groton and Harvard and Columbia. He entered the practice of law. He married, at twenty, a distant cousin, the magnificent Eleanor Roosevelt, who after a rather sad childhood, gradually acquired those qualities which were to make her an ideal wife and companion, later a prudent and indefatigable political helpmate to her husband, and finally, one of the great ladies of the world.

Gosnell gives due credit to each of these women, mother and wife, as forces in the shaping of his subject's character, as preceptors, protectors and confidantes. He gives proper credit also to Louis Howe, the wizened little journalist, who was Roosevelt's chief tactical advisor until his death. Proper and moderate credit is also given Wilson, Daniels, Smith, Farley, Flynn, the "Brains Trust," Hopkins, Sherwood and Rosenman. Omitted from the record are some persons whose influence or help must have been great; unduly emphasized is the role of others. There is always a tendency to assign to those who reminisce most volubly or extensively a disproportionately large significance. Nevertheless, the author makes it clear that Roosevelt never subordinated his judgment to that of others. Even as Daniels' assistant, he made most of the decisions. As President, he surrounded himself with new men. "No person who had exercised authority higher than Roosevelt's in 1913–1920 got a cabinet post. The new cabinet was composed of Roosevelt men who had their reputations to establish." Although Gosnell is aware of this problem of interpersonal relationships, he is content to give it only passing reference. It is worthy of special study, how Roosevelt held the affection and support of the many able men he used and discarded or thrust into some far corner of his domain.

The reasons for Roosevelt's successes are said to be: Roosevelt's character and traits, on which there is quite general agreement; not "easy money," since he was frequently an advocate of economy; not the support of the urban machines, although he was a "realist" in his treatment of them; the fact that he was patient, and usually could afford to be patient; the fact that he regarded public office as an opportunity for public service; the fact that he included in his experience intense interest in the business of politics and voluminous correspondence and contact with men in all walks of life; great adroitness and skill in handling journalists and critics; wide knowledge and skill in manipulating the language symbols of America, drawn from the Bible and from the words and deeds of great political leaders of the past.

Although there were external factors which made possible victories in 1940 and 1944, the most significant of Roosevelt's accomplishments are that he won every New York campaign in which he entered wholeheartedly, and that after he and Howe had worked and planned to that end for twenty years, he won the presidency in 1932. Naturally, since this is a report on Roosevelt as a campaigner, this book casts no light on the problem of a declining Democratic presidential vote from 1936 to 1952, during a period when there was no corresponding deterioration in the popular vote for Democratic candidates for Congress. Students of history, politics and of the phenomenon of leadership will find this volume very useful. This is especially true of Gosnell's statements on controversial issues, which he has adequately documented.—Roy V. Peel, *University of Utah.*

The Struggle for Survival: A Chronicle of Economic Mobilization in World War II. By Eliot Janeway. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1951. Pp. ix, 382. Chronicles of America, Vol. 53, $2.50; trade ed. $5.00.)

This is an exasperating book addressed to an important topic, the ability of our people to discipline themselves in unity of purpose and to marshal their strength to mount and sustain the home front effort required for the successful prosecution of war, if not for national survival. This account does not stress statistics of achievement, nor systematic exposition of the governmental machinery evolved, nor the industrial or governmental techniques devised. Instead the author concentrates on the political story, largely in terms of the personalities involved. His opening theme (marred by an obvious strain for the literary effects of chiasmus) is that Roosevelt put his faith of ultimate success more in the developing momentum of production than in expert management. Time, and the involvement of all the people, were the basic needs, rather than skilled administration; and Roosevelt spent his attention accordingly. Nevertheless, much of the story consists in lamenting that the suppressed report of the War Resources Board in 1939, credited to Baruch, was not put into effect, and in criticizing officials for administrative bungling. The author has his pets, e.g., Baruch, Forrestal, Eberstadt, Clay; and his pet hates, e.g., Nelson, Stettinius, Hopkins.

The author is a journalist who purports to give us the lowdown on maneuvers and feuds within the wartime administration, even to the point of interpreting the inner thoughts of his characters. In doing so he loses sight of his main theme and violates a first canon of scholarship, that the reader be given enough of the evidence to judge the reliability of the conclusions. It may be that a good deal of what he says is so; this is not the place for reappraisal of the events. But so many of his statements and characterizations are so positive and tendentious that I am strongly reminded of the judge who said he might be in error but he was never in doubt.—Harvey C. Mansfield, *Ohio State University.*

TVA: Democracy on the March; Twentieth Anniversary Edition. By David E. Lilienthal. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1953. Pp. xxiv, 294. $3.50.)

After revisiting and re-examining TVA, Lilienthal has revised his 1943 story and has written a prefatory note summarizing his conclusions of 1953. He concludes that the principles described in the 1943 edition are "as sturdy and workable as ever," that standards of competence and integrity have been preserved in the agency, and that the TVA offers a pattern of decentralized, unified management which is applicable to other river basins in this and other countries.

Valley of Tomorrow: The TVA and Agriculture. By Norman I. Wengert. (Knoxville: Bureau of Public Administration, University of Tennessee. 1952. Pp. xv, 151. $1.50.)

An analysis of TVA's agricultural program and of the varied administrative relationships involved in its development, with a critical evaluation of the agency's performance against the standard of regional resource development of which TVA is symbolic.

Political and Civil Rights in the United States. By Thomas I. Emerson and David Haber. (Buffalo, New York: Dennis & Co. 1952. Pp. xx, 1209.)

Introduced in a foreword by Robert M. Hutchins as "the only comprehensive collection of cases and materials on the most important subject in the world today," this "casebook" includes the following topics: security of the person, fairness in governmental procedures, right of franchise, freedom of speech (3 chapters, 447 pages), academic freedom, freedom of religion, discrimination. It includes elaborate notes collecting the major legal and related materials. Designed primarily for law students and lawyers, it will be useful also to political scientists for reference and class use.

Basic American Documents. Edited by George B. de Huszar, Henry W. Littlefield, and Arthur W. Littlefield. (Ames, Iowa: Littlefield, Adams & Co. 1953. Pp. x, 365. $1.50.)

American historical documents rated most significant by 277 teachers of American government and history are presented chronologically with brief introductory notes. The 53 documents with the highest ratings are in substantially complete form, and 57 others are summarized.

The Faith of Our Fathers: An Anthology of Americana, 1790–1860. Edited by Irving

MARK AND EUGENE L. SCHWAAB. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1952. Pp. xviii, 396. $4.75.)

124 selections from writings, speeches, resolutions, and petitions of ordinary people and less renowned leaders to illustrate their aspirations for political, economic, and social betterment.

The New Dictionary of American History. BY MICHAEL MARTIN AND LEONARD GELBER. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1952. Pp. v, 695. $10.00.)

Projected as a ready reference source of the subject matter of American history, this volume contains over 4,000 biographical and descriptive sketches, alphabetically arranged.

The Complete Madison: His Basic Writings. EDITED BY SAUL K. PADOVER. (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1953. Pp. ix, 361. $4.00.)

A well-selected and logically arranged collection of the principal writings of James Madison, including his contributions to *The Federalist Papers* and to the debates in the constitutional conventions, together with excerpts from other essays and speeches and from his correspondence, with an introduction by the editor.

The American Electoral College. BY ROGER LEA MACBRIDE. (Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, Ltd. 1953. Pp. 89. $0.75.)

A very brief and rather superficial review of the history and operation of the electoral college and the problem of its reform.

William L. Wilson and Tariff Reform. BY FESTUS P. SUMMERS. (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press. 1953. Pp. xi, 288. $5.00.)

A scholarly presentation of the political career and tariff-reform activities of a well-known politician of the Cleveland era.

His Lordship's Patronage: Offices of Profit in Colonial Maryland. BY DONNELL MACCLURE OWINGS. (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society. 1953. Pp. xii, 214.)

A study of the "origins, growth, and final pattern" of the numerous offices of profit in colonial Maryland with an appended chronology and civil list.

Bourbon Democracy of the Middle West: 1865–1896. BY HORACE SAMUEL MERRILL. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1953. Pp. viii, 300. $4.50.)

A review of the close cooperation of big business and politics in the Middle West during the last third of the 19th century. The study is well-documented and interestingly written.

The Great American Parade. BY H. J. DUTEIL. TRANSLATED BY FLETCHER PRATT. (New York: Twayne Publishers. 1953. Pp. 321. $3.75.)

A foreigner's view of the social institutions, ideas, foibles and way of life of the American people, which purports to represent what all Europeans think of America.

Ideas and Issues in Public Administration: A Book of Readings. EDITED BY DWIGHT WALDO. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1953. Pp. x, 462. $5.50.)

A well-selected group of thought-provoking readings with pungent, lively introductory notes by the editor.

Reader in Public Opinion and Communication: Enlarged Edition. EDITED BY BERNARD BERELSON AND MORRIS JANOWITZ. (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. 1953. Pp. xi, 611. $5.50.)

This compilation of readings in public opinion, originally published in 1950, has been enlarged by the addition of a section on "Methods in Public Opinion Research."

Business and Government. BY MARSHALL EDWARD DIMOCK. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1953. Pp. xvi, 799. $6.50.)

This revision of a college text first published in 1949 includes a new chapter on "The Cold War Economy" and makes some rearrangement of chapters and materials to provide "better integration throughout."

Government and the American Economy, 1870—Present: Select Problems in Historical Interpretation. BY THOMAS G. MANNING AND DAVID M. POTTER WITH THE COLLABORATION OF WALLACE E. DAVIES. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1950. Pp. xvi, 464.)

Documentary materials grouped around selected topics, and accompanied by editorial explanation. In some cases, such as OPA and agriculture under the New Deal, the topics are recent, while in others, such as railroads and antitrust, the analysis is not brought up to date. The purpose is, however, to illustrate the historical process. Paper bound, small print.

Free Enterprise and Economic Organization: Legal and Related Materials. By Louis B. Schwartz. (Brooklyn: The Foundation Press. 1952. Pp. xx, 1215.)

A casebook, designed primarily for law students, which includes materials on antitrust and on controls over price by government or under its sanction.

Government's Role in Economic Life. By George A. Steiner. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1953. Pp. xi, 440. $6.00.)

A college text written by an economist but dealing as much with political, legal, and administrative aspects of government's role as with economic aspects. It provides an overall analysis of forces, goals, and means, and an extended analysis of public policy in the depression of the 1930's and the national-security crisis of the 1940's, but does not summarize, as do most texts, particular lines of government policy relating to agriculture, labor, and business.

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

FRANKLIN L. BURDETTE

University of Maryland

ARTICLES AND BOOKLETS

National Government

Gordon, Emanuel L. Loss of Citizenship by Continuous Residence Abroad. *Columbia Law Review.* April, 1953.

Hambro, Lois H. Denaturalization under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. *Michigan Law Review.* April, 1953.

Hansen, Orval. The Federal Lobbying Act: A Reconsideration. *George Washington Law Review.* April, 1953.

Hobbs, Edward H. Executive Reorganization in the National Government. Bureau of Public Administration, University of Mississippi. 1953.

Jackson, Robert H. A Presidential Legal Opinion. *Harvard Law Review.* June, 1953.

Nelson, Delmas H. The Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1950. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1953.

Wilmerding, Lucius, Jr. The Vice Presidency. *Political Science Quarterly.* March, 1953.

State Government

Annual Legislative Sessions. Kansas Legislative Council. 1953.

Kammerer, Gladys M. Advisory Committees in the Legislative Process. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1953.

Lee Eugene C. State Equalization of Local Assessments. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 1953.

Rothenberg, Leon. State Budgets—1953. *State Government.* May, 1953.

Staniford, Edward F. Coordination of State Safety Programs. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 1953.

Toll Roads and Toll Authorities. *State Government.* June, 1953.

Local Government

Haar, Charles M. Zoning for Minimum Standards: The Wayne Township Case. *Harvard Law Review.* April, 1953.

Isakoff, Jack F., and Gilbert Y. Steiner. Illinois Municipal Revenue. Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois. 1953.

Kennedy, Harold W., and Arvo Van Alstyne. Convention Expenses of Local Government Officials. *Western City.* April, 1953.

Modern Management for the City of New York, Vol. I. Report of the Mayor's Committee on Management Survey. 1953.

Scott, Stanley, Joseph D. Lubin, and Robert J. McNeill. Public Services in Unincorporated Communities. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 1953.

Vogel, Joshua H., and Ernest H. Campbell. Municipal Regulation of Traffic View Obstructions. Bureau of Governmental Research and Services, University of Washington. 1953.

Willmott, John F. How To Install a Budget System. *Public Management.* April, 1953.

Constitutional Law and Civil Liberties

Allen, Francis A. Due Process and State Criminal Procedures: Another Look. *Northwestern University Law Review.* March–April, 1953.

Bilger, Donald E. Contumacy before the Legislature. *George Washington Law Review.* April, 1953.

Bischoff, Ralph F. Minority Rights and Majority Rule. *Virginia Law Review.* June, 1953.

Blumrosen, Alfred W. Equal Protection—Validity of State Restraints on Alien Ownership of Land. *Michigan Law Review.* May, 1953.

Civil Rights in the United States, 1952: A Balance Sheet of Group Relations. American Jewish Congress and National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. 1953.

Clark, Homer. The Supreme Court and the Amending Process, *Virginia Law Review.* June, 1953.

Constitutional Restraints on the Expulsion and Exclusion of Aliens. *Minnesota Law Review.* May, 1953.

The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation: A Social Science Statement. *Minnesota Law Review.* May, 1953.

Ernst, Morris L., and Arthur Joel Katz. Speech: Public and Private. *Columbia Law Review.* May, 1953.

Gardner, George K. Bailey v. Richardson and the Constitution of the United States. *Boston University Law Review.* April, 1953.

Hart, Henry M., Jr. The Power of Congress to Limit the Jurisdiction of Federal Courts: An Exercise in Dialectic. *Harvard Law Review.* June, 1953.

Hough, Richard Lee. The Jehovah's Witnesses Cases in Retrospect. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1953.

Indritz, Phineas. Racial Ramparts in the Nation's Capital. *Georgetown Law Journal.* March, 1953.

Morley, Felix. Treaty Law and the Constitution: A Study of the Bricker Amendment. American Enterprise Association. 1953.

Murray, John M. The Privilege against Self-Incrimination versus Immunity: Proposed Statutes. *Georgetown Law Journal.* May. 1953.

The Privilege against Self Incrimination: Does It Exist in the Police Station? *Stanford Law Review.* April, 1953.

The Proper Scope of the Civil Rights Acts. *Harvard Law Review.* May, 1953.

Schubert, Glendon A., Jr. The Steel Case: Presidential Responsibility and Judicial Irresponsibility. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1953.

Smith, James Barclay. The Privilege of Silence and the Legislative Process. *Georgetown Law Journal.* March, 1953.

Smith, James Morton. The Aurora and the Alien and Sedition Laws. Part II. *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography.* April, 1953.

State Views on Economic Due Process: 1937–1953. *Columbia Law Review.* June, 1953.

Judicial Administration and Law Enforcement

Kaplan, Benjamin, and Livingston Hall, eds. Judicial Administration and the Common Man. [Symposium.] *The Annals.* May, 1953.

King, Rufus G. The Narcotics Bureau and the Harrison Act: Jailing the Healers and the Sick. *Yale Law Journal.* April, 1953.

Lyon, Charles S. The Crime of Income Tax Fraud: Its Present Status and Function. *Columbia Law Review.* April, 1953.

Narcotics Regulation. *Yale Law Journal.* April, 1953.

Rice, Ralph S. Judicial Techniques in Combating Tax Avoidance. *Michigan Law Review.* May, 1953.

Schaeffer, Wendell G. Management in the Judiciary. *Public Administration Review.* Spring, 1953.

Vanderbilt, Arthur T. The Essentials of a Sound Judicial System. *Northwestern University Law Review.* March–April, 1953.

Public Administration and Administrative Law

Cozad, Lyman H. Research in Smaller Personnel Agencies. *Public Personnel Review.* April, 1953.

Etheridge, Fletcher H. Appeals from Administrative Decisions in Government Contract Disputes. *Texas Law Review.* May, 1953.

Flemming, Arthur S. The Civil Servant in a Period of Transition. *Public Administration Review.* Spring, 1953.

Fuchs, Ralph F. Judicial Control of Administrative Agencies in Indiana: II. *Indiana Law Journal.* Spring, 1953.

Gange, John. The Secretariat Function: A Staff Aid for Executive Management. Public Administration Clearing House. 1953.

Heckman, Jerome H. Our Immigration Laws, A Continuing Affront to the Administrative Procedure Act. *Georgetown Law Journal.* March, 1953.

Pfiffner, John M. Research in Organization Effectiveness. *Public Personnel Review.* April, 1953.

Schwartz, Bernard. A Decade of Administrative Law: 1942–1951. *Michigan Law Review.* April, 1953.

———. Primary Administrative Jurisdiction and the Exhaustion of Litigants. *Georgetown Law Journal.* May, 1953.

Political Parties, Elections, and Public Opinion

Bone, Hugh A., ed. The 1952 Elections in the Eleven Western States. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1953.

DeSantis, Vincent P. The Presidential Election of 1952. *Review of Politics.* April, 1953.

Gable, Richard W. NAM: Influential Lobby or Kiss of Death? *Journal of Politics.* May, 1953.

Hayes, Isabella Mallory. Financing Presidential Campaigns: A Selected Bibliography of 1952 Literature. Library, University of Maryland. 1953.

Kobre, Sidney. How Florida Dailies Handled the 1952 Presidential Campaign. *Journalism Quarterly.* Spring, 1953.

Lieberman, J. Ben. Restating the Concept of Freedom of the Press. *Journalism Quarterly.* Spring, 1953.

Prosser, William L. Interstate Publication. *Michigan Law Review.* May, 1953.

Snyder, Earl A. Liability of Station Owners for Defamatory Statements Made by Political Candidates. *Virginia Law Review.* April, 1953.

Statutory Regulation of Political Campaign Funds. *Harvard Law Review.* May, 1953.

Turner, Julius. Primary Elections as the Alternative to Party Competition in "Safe" Districts. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1953.

Union Political Expenditures under Taft-Hartley Section 304. *Northwestern University Law Review.* March–April, 1953.

Waterbury, Lester E. Opinion Surveys in Civil Litigation. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Spring, 1953.

Economic and Social Functions

National Economy

Our Water Resources. Tax Foundation. 1953.

Business and Labor

Bernstein, Irving, and Hugh G. Lovell. Are Coal Strikes National Emergencies? *Industrial and Labor Relations Review.* April, 1953.

Billyou, De Forest. Railroad Reorganization under Section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act. *Virginia Law Review.* May, 1953.

Cary, William L. Government Financing of Essential Contractors: The Reorganization of the Glenn L. Martin Company. *Harvard Law Review.* March, 1953.

Faragher, Robert V., and Fritz F. Heimann. Price Stabilization during a Period of Cold War. *California Law Review.* Spring, 1953.

The Federal Employers' Liability Act, Part 1. [Symposium.] *Law and Contemporary Problems.* Spring, 1953.

Federal Jurisdiction over Unfair Competition. *Minnesota Law Review.* March, 1953.

Financing Unemployment Compensation. Tax Foundation. 1953.

Gregory, Charles O. Unprotected Activity and the NLRA. *Virginia Law Review.* May, 1953.

Hamann, H. F. The New Patent Act and the Presumption of Validity. *George Washington Law Review.* April, 1953.

Hays, Robert C. The California Law of Unfair Competition Takes a Turn—Against the Employer. *California Law Review.* Spring, 1953.

Kahn, Mark L. Wage Determination for Airline Pilots. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review.* April, 1953.

Kleiler, Frank M. Presidential Seizures in Labor Disputes. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review.* July, 1953.

———. White House Intervention in Labor Disputes. *Political Science Quarterly.* June, 1953.

Lakusta, Boris H. Regulation of Truckers for Hire in California. *California Law Review.* Spring, 1953.

Leland, Wilfred C., Jr. "We Believe in Employment on Merit, But . . ." *Minnesota Law Review.* March, 1953.

Loyalty and Private Employment: The Right of Employers to Discharge Suspected Subversives. *Yale Law Journal.* May, 1953.

Monopsony in Manpower: Organized Baseball Meets the Antitrust Laws. *Yale Law Journal.* March, 1953.

Morton, Davis W., Jr., and Albert H. Cotton. Robinson-Patman Act—Anti-Trust or Anti-Consumer? *Minnesota Law Review.* March, 1953.

Netterville, Victor S. Local Service Airlines: Trunkline Suspensions in Aid of the Local

Service Experiment. *Southern California Law Review.* April, 1953.

Price Control: Prospect and Retrospect. [Symposium.] *Iowa Law Review.* Winter, 1953.

Priest, A. J. G. What Should Commissions Regulating Public Utilities Do About Accelerated Tax Amortization? *Virginia Law Review.* June, 1953.

The Requirement of "Concerted" Action under NLRA. *Columbia Law Review.* April, 1953.

Rich, Giles S. Infringement under Section 271 of the Patent Act of 1952. *George Washington Law Review.* April, 1953.

Shay, Robert Paul. Regulation W: Experiment in Credit Control. University of Maine Studies. 1953.

Slichter, Sumner H. Revision of the Taft-Hartley Act. *Quarterly Journal of Economics.* May, 1953.

Somers, Herman M. and Anne R. Industrial Safety and Health in the United States. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review.* July, 1953.

Tower, Charles H. Secondary Boycotts and the Taft-Hartley Act: Some Suggestions for Amendment. *George Washington Law Review.* April, 1953.

Trade Rules and Trade Conferences: The FTC and Business Attack Deceptive Practices, Unfair Competition, and Antitrust Violations. *Yale Law Journal.* May, 1953.

Williams, C. Dickerman. Transportation Regulation and the Department of Commerce. *Yale Law Journal.* March, 1953.

Health, Education, and Welfare

Hayman, Donald B. Social Security and State and Local Retirement in North Carolina. Institute of Government, University of North Carolina. 1953.

Military Affairs and National Security

Cuneo, Gilbert A. Armed Services Board of Contract Appeals: Tyrant or Impartial Tribunal? *American Bar Association Journal.* May, 1953.

Feld, Benjamin. The Court-Martial Sentence: Fair or Foul? *Virginia Law Review.* April, 1953.

Lawrence, James F. Trial of Civilians by Military Tribunals under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. *George Washington Law Review.* June, 1953.

Perkins, James A. Administration of the National Security Program. *Public Administration Review.* Spring, 1953.

Reddick, L. D. The Negro Policy of the American Army since World War II. *Journal of Negro History.* April, 1953.

The Reserves of the Armed Forces: A Historical Symposium. *Military Affairs.* Spring, 1953.

Tomkins, Dorothy C. Civil Defense in the States; a Bibliography. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 1953.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Congress

House. Committee on Agriculture. Agricultural Credit. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Conservation and Watershed Programs. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Dairy Industry. Hearings before Special Subcommittee. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Farm Credit Act of 1953. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Banking and Currency. Amendment to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Extension of Export Control Act of 1949. Hearing. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Housing Amendments of 1953. Hearings. Also House Report No. 653. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Rent Control, 1953. Hearings. Also Housing and Rent Act of 1953. House Report No. 275. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Government Operations. Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Hearings before Subcommittee. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Limitation of Federal Expenditures. Hearing. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 (Department of Agriculture). Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953 (Department of Defense). Hearings. Also, Disapproving Reorganization Plan No.

6. House Report No. 652. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Statehood for Alaska. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also House Report No. 675. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Flammable Fabrics Act. Hearings. Also House Report No. 425. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Un-American Activities. Investigation of Communist Activities in the Los Angeles Area. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Investigation of Communist Activities in the New York City Area. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Ways and Means. Customs Simplification. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Unemployment Insurance. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Message from the President. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953. House Doc. No. 102. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. House Doc. No. 111. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953. House Doc. No. 120. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1953, Providing for Reorganizations in the Department of Justice. House Doc. No. 130. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1953, Relating to the Export-Import Bank of Washington. House Doc. No. 135. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1953, Relating to the Department of Defense. House Doc. No. 136. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

House and Senate. Committees on the Judiciary. Federal Construction Contract Act. Joint Hearing before Subcommittees. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committees on Public Works. Niagara Power Development. Joint Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

Senate. Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Farm Credit Act of 1953. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Armed Services. Ammunition Shortages in the Armed Services. Hearings before Subcommittee. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Differential Pays for the Armed Services of the United States. Report of the Strauss Commission on Incentive-Hazardous Duty and Special Pays. Committee Print. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Report of the Rockefeller Committee on Department of Defense Organization. Committee Print. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Banking and Currency. Government Lending Agencies. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Housing Act Amendments of 1953. Hearings. Also Senate Report No. 455. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Finance. Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953. Statements submitted to Committee. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Foreign Relations. Adequacy of United States Laws with Respect to Offenses against National Security. Legal Analysis by Library of Congress. Committee Print. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Government Operations. Amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to Provide for More Effective Evaluation of the Fiscal Requirements of the Executive Agencies. Senate Report No. 295. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Creation of Commissions to Study Federal Reorganizations, and Federal-State Relations. Hearing. Also Senate Reports Nos. 215 and 216. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. Hearings before Subcommittee on Reorganization. Also Senate Report No. 297. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Outer Continental Shelf. Hearings. Also Senate Report No. 411. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Submerged Lands. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Broadcasting and Televising Baseball Games. Hearings before Subcommittee. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Survey of Organization and Operations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Report by Wolf Management Engineering Co. Committee Print. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on the Judiciary. Additional Circuit and District Judges. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also Senate Report No. 224. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Amending the Constitution Relative to the Taking of Private Property. Hearing before Subcommittee. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Court of Claims as a Constitutional Court. Hearing before a Subcommittee. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Immunity of Witnesses Appearing before Congressional Committees. Senate Report No. 153. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Rules of Practice and Procedure before Federal Agencies. Hearing before a Subcommittee. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Salaries of Members of Congress, Federal Judges, and United States Attorneys. Hearing before Subcommittee. Also Senate Report No. 262. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Subversive Influence in the Educational Process. Hearings before Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Treaties and Executive Agreements. Hearings before Subcommittee. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Taft-Hartley Act Revisions. Hearings. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Administration of the Classification Act of 1949 and the Compensation Process Established by the Act. Senate Doc. No. 34. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Analysis of the Whitten Amendment. Senate Doc. No. 35. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Appeals and Grievance Procedures in the Federal Government. Senate Doc. No. 33. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Effect of Personnel Office Staffing Ratios on Manpower Utilization. Senate Doc. No. 28. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Improving the Federal Administrative Management Program. Senate Doc. No. 36. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Manpower Utilization by the Federal Government through the Use of Private Contract Labor. Senate Doc. No. 32. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Military Personnel in Civilian Occupations. Senate Doc. No. 30. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Personnel Investigations of Employees and Applicants for Employment in the Executive Branch of the Government for Loyalty, Suitability, and Security. Senate Doc. No. 29. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess.

——— ———. Personnel Recruitment and Employment Practices in the Federal Government. Senate Doc. No. 37. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

——— ———. Training and Education in the Federal Government. Senate Doc. No. 31. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Select Committee on Small Business. Small Business and Defense Subcontracts. Senate Report No. 206. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

———. Subversive Activities Control Board. Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States, vs. Communist Party of the United States of America. Senate Doc. No. 41. 83rd Cong., 1st Sess. 1953.

Other Federal

Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Governments Division. Governments in the United States in 1952. 1953.

Judicial Conference of the United States. Reports of Proceedings of Special Sessions, March 26–27 and May 8, 1953. 1953.

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

Nationalization in Practice: The British Coal Industry. By William Warren Haynes. (Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University. 1953. Pp. xviii, 413. $4.00.)

In a complete analysis of nationalization in the British coal industry, the author treats two aspects that are of special interest to the political scientist. The first is what happens when a major industry is taken over for government operation. The author finds the answer to be neither the Utopia the socialists have been seeking, nor the release of a destructive revolutionary force that the conservatives feared. In fact what happens is what one might expect to happen when a new organization sets about to deal with an old and difficult problem: disappointment and apathy at the bottom, frustration at intermediate levels, turmoil and indecision at the top. There is no magic in nationalization. The old problems of wages, output, managerial competence, accountability, pricing and new investment remain. The magic, if any, is in rationalization: large-scale management not unfamiliar in most large U. S. corporations. However, in the particular context of the British coal industry, it is hard to see how rationalization could have been obtained except by nationalization.

The second aspect of interest is the struggle with administrative measures (Chs. XII–XV). First, one notes a movement away from autonomy in the legislative provisions fixing the relations between the National Coal Board and the Parliament. Second, it is interesting that while the Coal Board was strongly functional in its original organization with each member except the Chairman and Deputy Chairman in charge of a department, changes arising out of experience have made the Board preponderantly nonfunctional. Third, since coal mining is an activity in which field operations are especially significant, it was inevitable that the problem of decentralization should demand early attention. With a functionally organized Board, it was natural that the "parallel vertical pipes of communication" with their centralizing effect should tend to dominate, causing confusion and undermining the colliery manager. Changes in organization made to remedy this situation have emphasized the command channel, thus adding evidence to support administrative theory that decentralization necessitates an integral responsibility at each area level.—ERWIN W. BARD, *Brooklyn College.*

Türkiyede Siyasî Partiler, 1859–1952 [Political Parties in Turkey, 1859–1952]. BY DR. TARIK Z. TUNAYA. (Istanbul: Dogan Kardeş Yaymlam A. Ş. Basmevi. 1952. Pp. viii, 799.)

Dr. Tunaya, of Istanbul University Law School, has produced a closely printed volume of 758 pages listing formally 133 parties founded in Turkey since 1814, including thirty-five that have been established since 1923 and treating twelve as currently active. The body of the text contains a considerable volume of party constitutions and platforms.

Professor Tunaya concludes that the two parliamentary periods ending in 1918 and 1945 were characterized by such bitter interparty rivalry as to preclude a functional multiparty parliamentary system. In spite of the fact that most of the 133 parties catalogued were mere incipient gestures, he believes that the only satisfactory guarantee of personal liberty and political stability in Turkey is such a system of group formation—which he implies became viable in Turkey in 1945 with the end of ruthless Republican suppression of rival groups.

One might note that political party platforms exhibit a common thread of emphasis on the necessity for raising levels of living and production in Turkey.—EASTIN NELSON, *University of Texas.*

Comparative Political Institutions: A Study of Modern Democratic and Dictatorial Systems. BY DANIEL WIT. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1953. Pp. ix, 534. $4.75.)

A broad-based effort to make the study of comparative government comparative by use of a "functional" approach. The author focuses on a given function or institutional process, adducing detail from a number of governmental systems. Ample, though necessarily inadequate, materials on particular governments, mainly those of the United States, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, and Western European countries, are interspersed. The emphasis is on cultural and ideological factors.

Documents on Fundamental Human Rights. Pamphlets I, II, and III. COMPILED AND EDITED BY ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, JR. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1951, 1951, 1952. Pp. 277, 278–633 (with unpaged appendix), 634–998.)

Pamphlet I includes primarily American documents (charters, state constitutions, etc.) before 1791 but also six British documents and the French declaration of 1789; Pamphlet II includes cases and other documents on "Habeas Corpus and Freedom from Unlawful Detention" and suggestions for student papers on human rights; Pamphlet III deals with bills of attainder, *ex post facto* laws, freedom of debate in Congress, and human rights in recent foreign constitutions and United Nations documents.

Monarchism in the Weimar Republic. BY WALTER H. KAUFMANN. (New York: Bookman Associates. 1953. Pp. 305. $4.00.)

This is a careful study of the rise and fall of the monarchic movement in Weimar Germany from 1918 to 1933. After having set the stage in a brief introductory chapter describing the political scene in Germany on the eve of World War I, the author breaks the period under review into two phases, using the abortive Kapp putsch of 1923 as the dividing line. He finds that during the first phase the monarchists were the core of a violent rightist opposition to the republican form of government while from 1923 to 1933 they became more moderate, accepted the Republic, but gradually became outflanked by the more radical National Socialists. The book is well-documented and is a valuable contribution to the vast and still growing literature on the life and death of the Weimar Republic.

Systematisches und alphabetisches Verzeichnis der Gemeinden der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, Stand Januar 1953. BY STAATLICHE ZENTRALVERWALTUNG FÜR STATISTIK OF THE REGIERUNG DER DEUTSCHEN DEMOKRATISCHEN REPUBLIK. (Berlin: VEB Deutscher Zentralverlag. 1953. Pp. 91.)

The law of July 23, 1952, "über die weitere Demokratisierung des Aufbaus und der Arbeitsweise der staatlichen Organe in den Ländern" of the German Democratic Republic abolished the Länder and replaced them by 14 Bezirke. The "Verzeichnis" arranges the cities and towns by Bezirk and under each by Kreis. At the end is a map showing the Kreise.—J.B.C.

Landtags Handbuch. (2. Wahlperiode.) (Saarbrücken: Landtagsverwaltung. 1953. Looseleaf, 20 sections, mainly mimeographed in foolscap folio format.)

The manual of the Saar parliament for the second electoral period, intended mainly for the use of the fifty members, includes not only the rules as drafted in 1951, the Constitution of December 15, 1947 as printed in the *Amtsblatt*, but also various basic laws such as those on the general administration of the Saar, the budget, control of accounts, the flag, the coat of arms, and the official seal. Ballots from the three election districts for the election of November 30, 1952, are included as well as the law and the regulations governing the election. The list of the Landtag members gives occupations and addresses. There is a grouping by parties, 29 representing the Christliche Volkspartei des Saarlandes, 17 the Sozial Demokratische Partei des Saarlandes, and 4 the Communist Party. There are three women members. The first session of the second electoral period was held on December 15, 1952.—J.B.C.

Handbuch des Abgeordnetenhauses von Berlin. 1. Wahlperiode (ab. 11. Januar 1951). (Berlin: Hrsg. vom Büro des Abgeordnetenhauses. 1952. Pp. 219.)

Under the Constitution of September 1, 1950, drawn up by the Stadtverordnetenversammlung, the city of Berlin (western sector) became a "Land" of the Bundesrepublik. The handbook of the first Berlin Parliament includes not only the 1950 Berlin Constitution but also the Federal Constitution, the rules of the parliament, the electoral law, the results of the election of December 3, 1950, brief biographies of the two hundred members, and various other pertinent information. The debates of the parliament beginning with the first meeting on January 11, 1951, are published from day to day under the title *Stenographischer Bericht.*—J.B.C.

Das amtliche Schrifttum der Bundesrepublik, unter Mitwirkung des Presse- und Informationsamtes der Bundesregierung und der Bundesministerien. (Bonn: Deutscher Bundes-Verlag, G. m. b. H. 1952. Pp. 47.)

This much needed brief guide to the official publications of the federal republic of Germany is limited to the Bundestag, the Bundesrat, the Bundeskasszleramt, and the ministries, and gives with most items some characterization as well as information relative to procurement.—J.B.C.

Les journaux officiels de la République française: étude historique et analytique. BY DIRECTION DE LA DOCUMENTATION. (Paris: La Documentation française. 1953. Pp. 22. Notes et études documentaires, no. 1,738. Série française, cccxxi.)

The official gazettes of France from 1789 to date form a maze of increasing complexity sufficient to daunt the most hardy searcher for laws, decrees, regulations, parliamentary debates, documents, administrative reports, etc. More than 40,000 pages annually now of the *Journal officiel de la République française* are divided among some ten different editions plus three other publications. From 1869 to 1950, the complete collection of the *Journal officiel* amounts to 1500 volumes. Without the help of the present brief guide, "le lecteur profane risque de s'y perdre avant d'avoir atteint son but."—J.B.C.

Les élections législatives du 17 juin 1951. BY MINISTÈRE DE L'INTÉRIEUR. (Paris: La Documentation française. 1953. Pp. 452. Collection "Recueils et monographies," 20.)

The detailed report on the elections of June 17, 1951, to the French National Assembly includes the text of the electoral laws, general statistics along with six maps of France showing the principal tendencies of opinion, and the returns from each "département," from the four overseas départements, from Algeria, and from the overseas territories, and a final set of tables showing the returns from special elections of June 17, 1951 and December 31, 1952, to fill seats of deputies deceased, resigned, and incapacitated.—J.B.C.

Commission mixte d'enquête sur le fonctionnement des services de l'Etat et des institutions parétatiques. *Premier rapport aux Chambres législatives.* (Brussels: Moniteur belge. March 12, 1952. 122^e année, n. 72, pp. 1714–1792.)

The Belgian Commission on the Organization of the Government was authorized (by a law of June 1, 1949 although it did not begin work until October 1950) to find ways and means of increasing the efficiency of the government services as well as of making budgetary economies. The first report, dated December 22, 1951, and presented by H. Matton, the chairman, recommended among other things that two "parétatique" bodies be abolished.—J.B.C.

State of Travancore-Cochin. *The Travancore-Cochin Legislative Assembly Manual.* (Ernakulam: Government Press. 1952. Pp. xii, 132.)

The manual includes the rules and standing orders, the articles of the Constitution of India as they apply to the legislatures of Part B states, the Payment of Salaries and Allowances Act, the Legislative Assembly (removal of disqualifications) Act, legislative library rules, procedure in respect of questions and answers, and prohibition of simultaneous membership rules. English, Malayalam and Tamil are used for the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly. The states of Travancore and of Cochin were united as Travancore-Cochin in July, 1949.—J.B.C.

Travancore-Cochin Legislative Assembly. *A Selection from the Decisions from the Chair, 1922–1951.* With index. COMPILED BY K. MAHADEVA AIYAR, EDITOR OF DEBATES OF THE TRAVANCORE-COCHIN LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY. (Ernakulam: Government Press. 1952. Pp. vi, 52.)

Compiled from the reports of the proceedings of the legislative bodies of Travancore, 1922–1949, of Cochin, 1925–1948, and of Travancore-Cochin, 1949–1951, in response to a request from the Secretary of the Parliament of India. A Conference of Indian Presiding Officers of legislative bodies in Sept., 1949 had requested states already having legislatures to compile and publish selections of decisions by the chair. The integrated legislative body of the integrated state which first met on July 11, 1949 was called "The Legislative Assembly of the United State of Travancore and Cochin," and after the Constitution of India came into force on Jan. 26th, 1950, the "Travancore-Cochin Legislative Assembly."—J.B.C.

The Official Gazette of the United Kingdom of Libya. (Tripoli, Libya: The Government Printer. 1951–. No. Extraordinary, 7th Oct., 1951, Vol. 1. No. 1, Oct. 24, 1951 to date.)

The Constitution of the United Kingdom of Libya as adopted at Benghazi on Oct. 7, 1951, is published in English as an extraordinary number of the *Official Gazette.* Libya, composed of the provinces of Cyrenaica, Fezzan, and Tripolitania, and having the two capitals of Benghazi and Tripoli, has Arabic as the official language.—J.B.C.

Nigeria. House of Representatives. *Debates. First Session. 29th, 30th and 31st January, 11th to 31st March and 1st to 9th April 1952.* (Lagos: Government Printer. 1952. 3 vols.)

Under the new Constitution of Nigeria, the first meeting of the Legislature was held on January 29–31, 1952, for organization, and the stenographic report of debates extends only to 18 pages. The last meeting of the Legislative Council, the former legislature, was held in August, 1951, when there was a debate on the holding of elections under the new constitution. The debates of the budget meeting in March and April extended to nearly twelve hundred pages in two volumes. In addition, there are regional legislatures in the Eastern, Northern, and Western regions, the debates of which are also available in printed form.—J.B.C.

Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly of the Gold Coast (Amended up to October, 1952). (Accra, Gold Coast: Government Printing Dept. 1952. Pp. 23.)

The rules of the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly, which began to function in 1951 under the new constitution, were drafted locally. In events not covered by the rules, reference is made to the House of Commons practice and to Erskine May. On February 17, 1953, the rules were amended mainly in reference to the procedure on appropriation bills. The Debates, which "shall be in the English language," are issued both in daily parts and in sessional volumes. In addition, a daily journal report is printed under the title *Minutes.* The daily time of sitting for the Assembly is from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m.—J.B.C.

Public Administration in Malaya. By S. W. Jones. (New York: Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1953. Pp. vii, 229. $3.00.)

Public Administration in Burma: A Study of Development During the British Connexion. By F. S. V. Donnison. (New York: Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1953. Pp. vii, 119. $2.50.)

Organization, methods and problems of public administration considered mainly in terms of its historical development in these two areas; about one-third of the Malaya volume is concerned with postwar affairs; the Burma study concludes with the end of British control.

Report on Mao's China. By Frank Moraes. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1953. Pp. vii, 212. $3.75.)

A perceptive report by the editor of *The Times of India,* who travelled briefly but widely in Red China in 1952 as a member of an Indian cultural delegation. While acknowledging significant economic and administrative advances, he laments the restraint and orthodoxy forced upon China's intellectuals and bureaucrats.

Utopia Ltd.: The Story of the English New Town of Stevenage. By Harold Orlans. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1953. Pp. xv, 313. $4.50.)

Study by an American anthropologist of the effort to carry out the New Towns Act, 1946, and of its impact on one of the towns to be developed. Interplay among local and regional interests, national policy, ministry, and Development Corporation is shown.

The British Parliament. By Strathearn Gordon. (New York: Frederick A. Praeger. 1952. Pp. 247. $4.25.)

New edition of a volume first issued in 1945 by the Hansard Society. A chapter on "Criticism of Parliament" and some useful tables have been added.

The Russians in Focus. By Harold J. Berman. (Boston: Little, Brown and Co. 1953. Pp. xii, 209. $3.00.)

A concise handbook of factual information on a number of facets of Soviet society and life, written by a research associate of the Russian Research Center at Harvard. It fulfills well its purpose, which is to provide the general reader with a basic minimum of knowledge about Soviet ways of life.

The Soviet Impact on Society: A Recollection. By Dagobert D. Runes. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1953. Pp. xiii, 202. $3.75.)

The bulk of the volume consists of a rather unsystematic discussion of various aspects of life in Soviet Russia prior to World War II (introduced by a few comments on Marxian teaching), while a few chapters deal with early communist attempts to take over in Hungary, Bavaria and China. The book was written 15 years ago.

South Africa. By Jan H. Hofmeyr. Revised by J. C. Cope. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc. 1953. Pp. x, 253. $3.75.)

A new edition of this standard volume by the late South African political leader. The older work has been brought up to date and four new chapters have been added.

Africa: A Study in Tropical Development. By L. Dudley Stamp. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1953. Pp. vii, 568. $8.50.)

A geographer's social-ecological study of the entire continent. The emphasis is on human needs and the resources available to satisfy them. Includes charts, maps, illustrations.

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON
FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

WILLIAM H. ROBERTS
Catholic University of America

General

Institute of Inter-American Affairs. Summarization of the First Annual Public Administration Field Conference; Montevideo, Uruguay; February 15–19, 1953. Prepared by the participants and published at Montevideo, Uruguay; February 24, 1953 (mimeo).

McWhinney, E. Le Droit Constitutionnel Comparé: Science de la Politique. *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionnelle.* April–June, 1952.

Rasch, E. Die Staatliche Bürokratie im Modernen Gesellschaftlichen Leben. *Archiv des öffentlichen Rechts.* May, 1953.

Spann, R. N. Thoughts on Administrative Case-Study. *Public Administration.* Spring, 1953.

Specific Areas

United Kingdom

Abrahamson, G. Die Sozialen Dienste in Grossbritannien. *Wirtschaftsdienst.* December, 1952.

Aris, R. Die Verfassungsrechtliche Entwicklung in Grossbritannien seit 1933. *Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart,* N.F., Vol. II, 1953.

Brooke, H. Conservatives and Local Government. *Political Quarterly.* April–June, 1953.

Bulmor-Thomas, I. How Conservative Policy is Formed. *Political Quarterly.* April–June, 1953.

Conservative Party. Research Department. Local Government Elections, 1953. London, Conservative and Unionist Central Office, 1953.

Cotter, C. P. Constitutionalizing Emergency Powers: The British Experience. *Stanford Law Review.* April, 1953.

Goldman, P. County and Borough; Problems of Local Government in England and Wales. London, Conservative Political Centre, 1952.

Harvey, L. G. The Party in Local Affairs. *National Municipal Review.* May, 1953.

Hollis, C. The British Constitution in 1952. *Parliamentary Affairs.* Spring, 1953.

——— Katholizismus in England. *Aussenpolitik.* May, 1953.

The Improbability of Local Government. *Fortnightly.* May, 1953.

Kelly, D. W. The Administration of the National Coal Board. *Public Administration.* Spring, 1953.

Maude, A. The Conservative Party and the Changing Class Structure. *Political Quarterly.* April–June, 1953.

United Kingdom: Parliament and Procedure. *Round Table.* March, 1953.

Colonial Areas

Carnell, F. Closer Association in British South-East Asia. *Eastern World.* May, 1953.

A Constitution for the Caribbean. *Economist.* April 11, 1953.

Gatty, R. Fiji: Colony in Transition. *Pacific Affairs.* June, 1953.

Great Britain. Colonial Office. Report on Nigeria for the Year 1951. London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1953.

Southern Rhodesia. High Commissioner. The African in Southern Rhodesia. Glasgow, Robert MacLehos & Co., 1952.

Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland Draft Federal Scheme. London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1952 (Cmd. 8573).

Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Report by the Conference on Federation held in London in January, 1953. London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1953 (Cmd. 8753).

Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. The Federal Scheme Prepared by a Conference held in London in January 1953. London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1953 (Cmd. 8754).

Uganda. Secretariat. Community Development in Uganda. *Journal of African Administration.* April, 1953.

Commonwealth of Nations

Anjaria, J. J. India's Five-Year Plan. *Current History.* June, 1953.

Basu, S. The Public Service Commission in India. *Public Administration.* Spring, 1953.

Bendheim, E. "Apartheidpolitik" in Südafrika. *Aussenpolitik.* June, 1953.

Cherry, H. D. The Constitutional Philosophy of India. *India Quarterly.* October–December, 1952.

L'Évolution Constitutionelle du Commonwealth. *Documentation Française—Notes et Etudes Documentaires.* November 26, 1952.

Herbert, H. W. The Future of Politics in Australia. *Australian Quarterly.* March, 1953.

India. Planning Commission. First Five Year Plan. Delhi, Publications Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, 1953.

India: The Five Year Plan. *Round Table.* March, 1953.

Pakistan: The Constitutional Controversy. *Round Table.* March, 1953.

Pauling, N. G. Labour and Politics in New Zealand. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science.* February, 1953.

United States. House of Representatives. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of Special Study Mission to Pakistan, India, Thailand and Indochina. 83d Cong., 1st sess., Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

Western Europe

Angier, J. The French Law on Industrial Ententes. *Cartel.* April, 1953.

Battelli, M. Il Referendum e l'Iniziativa Popolare in Isvizzera. *Il Politico.* April, 1953.

Beria, G. L'Évolution Constitutionnelle Française depuis 1944. *Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart,* N.F., Vol. II, 1953.

Boussenot, G. L'Assemblée de l'Union Française, son Rôle, l'Élargissement de ses Pouvoirs. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* January, 1953.

Campion, Lord. European Parliamentary Procedure. *Parliamentary Affairs.* Spring, 1953.

Canada. Department of National Health and Welfare. Health Insurance in Sweden. Ottawa, 1952.

De Visscher, M. P. L'Évolution du Droit Public Belge de 1930 à 1950. *Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart,* N.F., Vol. II, 1953.

France and the French Union. *Round Table.* March, 1953.

Frisch, A. Bedeutung des Mittelstande in der Französischen Sozialstruktur. *Wirtschaftsdienst.* March, 1953.

Gide, P. Le Projet Français de Loi Anti-Trust et les Expériences Étrangères. Paris, Librairie du Recueil Sirey, 1953.

Gonidec, P. F. Les Assemblées Locales des Territoires d'Outre-Mer. *Revue Juridique et Politique de l'Union Française.* July–September, 1952.

Guiton, R.-J. Probleme der Französischen Union. *Europa Archiv.* April 5, 1953.

Herlitz, N. Swedish Administration Law. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* April, 1953.

Historicus. La Vita Politica Italiana. *Rivista di Politica Economica.* February and April, 1953.

L'Organisation de la Sécurité Sociale en Belgique. *Bulletin d'Information et de Documentation de la Banque Nationale de Belgique.* March, 1953.

République Française. Minstère de l'Intérieur. Les Élections Législatives du 17 Juin 1951. Paris, Documentation Française, 1953.

Sorensen, M. Problèmes Politiques Contemporains du Danemark. *Revue Française de Science Politique.* October–December, 1952.

Tesauro, A. Il Disegno di Legge per la Riforma Elettorale. *Rassegna di Diritto Pubblico.* November–December, 1952.

Van der Pot, C. W. Die Entwicklung des Öffentlichen Rechts in den Niederlanden. *Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart,* N.F., Vol. II, 1953.

Central Europe

Adamovich, L. Die Entwicklung des Österreichischen Verfassungsrechts seit 27. April 1945. *Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart,* N.F., Vol. II, 1953.

Die Ausbeutung der Menschlichen Arbeitskraft in der Sowjetzone. Bonner Berichte aus Mittel- und Ostdeutschland. Bonn, Bundesministerium für Gesamtdeutsche Fragen, 1952.

Bonn, M. J. Potential Dangers in Germany. *Contemporary Review.* March, 1953.

Haas, D. Abschluss und Ratifikation Internationaler Verträge. *Archiv des öffentlichen Rechts.* May, 1953.

Hurter, E. Anti-Cartel Law Debate in West Germany. *Swiss Review of World Affairs.* April, 1953.

Kalisch, W. Grundrechte und Berufsbeamtentum nach dem Bonner Grundgesetz. *Archiv des öffentlichen Rechts.* May, 1953.

Nipperdey, H. C. La Loi Allemande sur l'Organisation Constitutionelle de l'Établissement. *Droit Social.* February, 1953.

Ortlieb, H. Der Kampf um Wirtschaftsdemokratie und Mitbestimmung. *Wirtschaftsdienst.* December, 1952.

Pilgert, H. P. The West German Educational

System. Historical Division, Office of the Executive Secretary, Office of the U. S. High Commissioner for Germany, 1953.

Plischke, E. Berlin: Development of its Government and Administration. Historical Division, Office of the Executive Secretary, Office of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, 1952.

Rechenschaftsbericht über die Deutsche Finanzpolitik 1949–1953. Bonn, Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung, 1953.

Redslob, R. La Charte de Bonn, son Charactère en Doctrine Constitutionnelle. *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionnelle.* July–September, 1952.

United States. Office of U.S. High Commissioner for Germany. Elections and Political Parties in Germany, 1945–1952. Prepared by Policy Reports Secretary, Office of Executive Secretary, 1952.

Wenke, H. Education in Western Germany. Library of Congress. Reference Department. European Affairs Division. Washington, 1953.

Wunderlich, F. Codetermination in German Industry. *Social Research.* Spring, 1953.

Soviet Union and Eastern Europe

Constitution de la République Populaire de Bulgarie. Sofia, 1948.

Declaration on the Aims and Tasks of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia. *Yugoslav Review.* March–April, 1953.

Djordjevic, J. Local Self-Government in Yugoslavia. *American Slavic and East European Review*, April, 1953.

——— Yugoslavia's New System of Government. *Fortnightly.* April, 1953.

Draft Statute of the Socialist Alliance of the Working People of Yugoslavia. *Yugoslav Review.* March–April, 1953.

Gallas, J. Social Security in the Peoples' Democratic Republics. *Bulletin of the International Social Security Association.* December, 1952.

Ivanovitch, M. La Loi Constitutionelle sur les Fondements de l'Organisation Sociale et Politique de la République Fédérative Populaire de Yougoslavie et sur les Organes Fédéraux du Pouvoir. *Questions Actuelles du Socialisme.* January–February, 1953.

Kasanzeff, A. Soviet Communist Propaganda. *Journal of the Institute for the Study of the History and the Institutions of the USSR.* No. 3, 1952.

Katzarov, C. Die Entwicklung des Öffentlichen Rechts in Bulgarien während und nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg. *Jahrbuch des öffentlichen Rechts der Gegenwart*, N.F., Vol. II, 1953.

Krynski, G. I. Management Problems in Soviet Public Enterprise as Indicated by Arbitration Awards. *American Slavic and East European Review.* April, 1953.

Meissner, B. Die Gesetzgeberische Tätigkeit des Obersten Sowjets der USSR und die Entwicklung der Sowjetexekutive von 1949–1953. *Europa Archiv.* May 20, 1953.

Paikert, G. C. Hungary's National Minority Policies, 1920–1945. *American Slavic and East European Review.* April, 1953.

Reshetar, J. S. National Deviation in the Soviet Union. *American Slavic and East European Review.* April, 1953.

Schlesinger, R. Notes on the Changing Functions of Party Congresses. *Soviet Studies.* April, 1953.

Schulz, L. Die Neue Verfassung Rumäniens, eine Entwicklungsstufe zum "Vollsozialismus." *Europa Archiv.* April 5, 1953.

Schwarz, S. M. New Light on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. *Problems of Communism.* No. 2, 1953.

Seton-Watson, H. The Colonial System of the USSR. *Commentary.* May, 1953.

"Soviet Imperialism." *Round Table.* December, 1952.

Sukiennicki, W. Soviet "Elections" in Poland. *Eastern Quarterly.* January–April, 1953.

Wiles, P. The Soviet Economy Outpaces the West. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1953.

Wolfe, D. W. The Struggle for the Soviet Succession. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1953.

Wynne, W., Jr. The Population of Czechoslovakia. U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. International Population Statistics Reports Series P-90, No. 3. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

Yugoslavia. *British Survey.* April, 1953.

Middle East and Africa

Badeau, J. S. The Emergence of Modern Egypt. *Foreign Policy Association Headline Series.* Number 98. March–April, 1953.

Documents Concerning Constitutional Development in the Sudan and the Agreement between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Egyptian Government Concerning Sudan. London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1953. (Cmd. 8767).

Farah, R. A. The Arab Church in Israel. *Muslim World.* October, 1952.

Lentz, W. Sondervollmachten für Mossadegh. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik.* November, 1952.

——— Die Verstaatlichung der Ölindustrie in Iran. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik.* October, 1952.

Martin, J. W. Some Aspects of National Budget Administration in Turkey. *Public Finance.* No. 1, 1953.

Rife, D. C. The Peoples of the Sudan. *Middle East Journal.* Spring, 1953.

Speiser, E. A. Cultural Factors in Social Dynamics in the Near East. *Middle East Journal.* Spring, 1953.

Southeast Asia

Bailey, S. D. Parliamentary Government in Southern Asia. New York, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1952.

Cady, J. F. Independent Burma. *Current History.* April, 1953.

Central Banking in Southern Asia. *Far Eastern Survey.* April 22, 1953.

Donnithorne, A. G. The Chinese in Indonesia. *Eastern World.* April, 1953.

Ingber, D. The Democratic Republic of Viet Nam. *Fortnightly.* February, 1953.

A Program for Strengthening Public Administration in the Kingdom of Thailand. Results of a Reconnaissance Survey of Public Administration in Thailand conducted under Contract Arrangements with Mutual Security Agency by Public Administration Service. May, 1952 (mimeo).

United States. Department of State. Office of Intelligence Research. Research on Southeast Asia. Washington, April, 1953.

Pacific and Far East

Barber, C. H. China's Political Officer System. *Military Review.* July, 1953.

Barnett, A. D. China's Road to Collectivization. *Journal of Farm Economics.* May, 1953.

——— Social Controls in Communist China. *Far Eastern Survey.* April 22, 1953.

Bryn-Jones, D. Japan's General Election 1952: an Interpretation. *Contemporary Japan.* Nos. 7–9, 1952.

Burke, A. W. A Note on the Emerging Administrative Structure of the Post-Treaty Japanese National Government. Occasional Papers, Center for Japanese Studies (Ann Arbor) No. 3, 1952.

Chao, Kuo-Chün. Chinese Land Policies. *Current History.* June, 1953.

Chen, T. Hsi-en. The Marxist Remolding of Chinese Society. *American Journal of Sociology.* January, 1953.

Douglas, L. H. Recent Elections in a Japanese Prefecture. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1953.

Grad, A. J. Land and Peasant in Japan. New York, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1952.

Haring, D. G. Japanese National Character. *Yale Review.* Spring, 1953.

Hsia, R. Price Control in Communist China. New York, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1953.

Ikematsu, F. Political Parties Today and Tomorrow. *Contemporary Japan.* Nos. 7–9, 1952.

Kondo, Y. The Land Reform in Japan. Tokyo. National Research Institute of Agriculture. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Bulletin No. 2. 1952.

Langer, P. F. Japanese Communism; an Annotated Bibliography. New York, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1953.

Sakata, T. The Peace Treaty and Independence of the Japanese Economy. *Midwest Journal.* Winter 1952/53.

Salazar, M. Philippine Labor Unions. *Pacific Affairs.* June, 1953.

Ukai, N. Japanese Election Results Reconsidered. *Pacific Affairs.* June, 1953.

United States. Department of State. Office of Intelligence Research. Research on China. Washington, April 1953.

——— Department of State. Office of Intelligence Research. Research on Japan. Washington, April, 1953.

Van Briessen, F. Japan seit der Niederlage. *Aussenpolitik.* June, 1953.

Ward, R. E. Some Observations on Local Autonomy at the Village Level in Present-Day Japan. *Far Eastern Quarterly.* February, 1953.

Latin America

Constitutional Law for the Republic of Cuba, April 4, 1952. Habana, Publicaciones Lewis, 1952.

Hillekamps, C. H. Bolivien unter der Nationalistischen Welle. *Aussenpolitik.* April, 1953.

Ls Auguste, Y. La Séparation des Pouvoirs dans la Constitution Haïtienne. *Revue Internationale d'Histoire Politique et Constitutionnelle.* July–September, 1952.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

Survey of British Commonwealth Affairs: Problems of External Policy, 1931–1939. By Nicholas Mansergh. (Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1952. Pp. xx, 481. $8.00.)

In this volume students of international affairs, as well as specialists on the British Commonwealth, are presented with a welcome addition to the series of studies inaugurated by Professor Hancock. Though Professor Mansergh's topic is the critical period in between the enactment of the Statute of Westminster and the outbreak of World War II, his treatment appropriately includes both earlier and later events for the sake of perspective. The Commonwealth thus surveyed was undergoing the transition consequent upon the recognition of Dominion status and the decentralization of authority over foreign policy. Their claims to equality and independence duly recognized, the member-nations, no one of whom possessed the means to assure its own defense, were quickly confronted with the brutal realities of Japanese, Italian, and German aggression. Their responses, both several and collective, form the theme of this book.

The record with which its contents deal provokes various reflections. In studying almost any aspect of the nineteen-thirties—those years, as has been said, that the locusts ate—one's impressions of the then bankruptcy of British statesmanship are forcibly renewed. No glimmer of greatness breaks through the dark void separating the era of Lloyd George from that of Churchill. Nor did the field of Commonwealth relations form any exception. In the interwar decades only Balfour, presiding at the Conference of 1926, was able to shed luster on the ceremony that conferred on former colonies the title-deeds to nationhood. But he in any case was a lone surviving Victorian, and no true product of the twentieth century; and the mantle he left after him was draped on narrower shoulders.

For their part, the premiers of the Commonwealth countries, except New Zealand's Savage, share responsibility for applauding and abetting the policy of appeasement from wholly diverse, yet curiously concurrent, motives. Serving their apprenticeship on unfamiliar problems in a time of unparalleled grimness, they, too, misjudged the men, events, and institutions, with which they had to work. Yet in September, 1939, all of them discovered that their dominant interest was to ensure that Britain should survive. All save Eire, whose vision of wide horizons was blocked by the sight of Ulster.

Of these matters Professor Mansergh offers a masterly analysis. His chapters embrace both the overall structure of the Commonwealth and the external relations of its component parts. He is at his best in the impartial exposition of rival viewpoints; in the handling of diplomatic documents, conference records, and legislation; and in his careful following of policies as they unwind themselves. The reader never loses interest; never fails to grasp the meaning from a style that is perfectly adapted to its content; and never ceases to admire the scholarship that has integrated so complex a subject. Some criticisms, however, are in order. Even though another volume of this series deals with economic policy up to 1936, Professor Mansergh still pays less heed than he might to economic factors. Only by painstaking search will the reader discover, in some brief and scattered lines, that a major depression existed in the early nineteen-thirties. He will not discover at all that the dominions reacted to the depression with a drive to industrialize which profoundly affected their politics, internal and external. He will peruse an elaborate chapter on South Africa, which contains but one casual and incidental reference on the salient fact that the Europeans are there outnumbered by four to one and which omits all discussion of different attitudes toward native policy. These shortcomings limit the comprehensiveness of the treatment, but still leave it admirable and indispensable in what the author has set out to cover.—Leslie Lipson, *University of California (Berkeley).*

International Shipping Cartels: A Study of Industrial Self-Regulation by Shipping Conferences. By Daniel Marx, Jr. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1953. Pp. xii, 323. $6.00.)

International economic policy is becoming increasingly important in the field of American foreign policy. A careful study of a major feature of the organization of the oceanic shipping industry is therefore to be welcomed by political scientists. In this descriptive analysis of shipping conferences the author, Professor of Economics at Dartmouth College and a former official of the War Shipping Administration, has provided such a study. Concerned neither to praise nor to blame, he has described the basic economics of the industry, the history of shipping conferences (intercompany agreements) since the first was organized in 1875 to regulate the trade between India and the British Isles, governmental investigations in various lands of these conferences, and plans and machinery for regulating conferences and their activities.

While the work is of primary interest to transportation economists, four aspects of it should appeal to political scientists. One is the detailed explanation of the many ways in which political factors have prevented the most economic development and operation of the international shipping industry. Considerations of national defense and national prestige have caused overbuilding and produced a multitude of protective devices ranging from outright subsidies through tonnage quotas to regulations stipulating the currency in which payments are to be made (pp. 38–44). A second is the attempt to cope, through investigations and various types of national legislation, with the monopolistic or oligopolistic conference agreements which stem from the cut-throat price competition arising in large part from the existence of surplus tonnage (pp. 45–136). A third is the recent postwar effort to develop an Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, a project parallelling the International Trade Organization and suffering the same fate (pp. 272–79). Lastly—although the author does not develop this point—the wartime efforts to achieve the most efficient use of the shipping resources of the western allies (pp. 5, 165, 272–73) deserve attention because they suggest how important would be the development of a similarly rational method of husbanding and marshalling the shipping resources of the North Atlantic powers for the duration of the cold war.

The author's primary conclusion (pp. 303–4) is that under the state system only minor improvements can be made in the present conference system for regulating prices and avoiding the disastrous effects of unrestricted competition in the international shipping industry. Sound as this conclusion appears to be, considered as an economist's verdict, the political scientist may well inquire whether the time has not come when national economics must give way to alliance economics.—MARSHALL KNAPPEN, *University of Michigan.*

The Indian Year Book of International Affairs, 1952. EDITED BY C. H. ALEXANDROWICZ. (Madras: University of Madras. 1952. Pp. xii, 316. Rs. 10.)

In this volume, the first of an annual series patterned after the well-known year books of the London Institute of World Affairs, a group of Indian scholars and a few foreigners who have special ties with India have made an important contribution to the study of international relations, international law, and international economics. The book contains seventeen articles, nine "research papers in the form of notes," a very useful summary of Indian decisions on international law, book reviews, a list of agreements entered into by the Government of India from August, 1947 to early 1952, and lists of books and articles on international affairs published in India in 1950, 1951, and 1952.

The articles and notes are a varied assortment indeed. The opening article on "India and the Balance of Power" by G. S. Bajpai, a famous Indian diplomat who is now Governor of Bombay, calls attention to the relation between politics and power, and argues that "A strong India is . . . necessary not only for the defence of its neutrality in the event of a world war but also for the effective pursuit of an independent foreign policy founded on her ideals" (p. 7). Harishwar Dayal, a Joint Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs, explains some of the difficulties and problems in organizing the Indian Foreign Service to meet the heavy demands placed upon it after independence. Professor Harrop A. Freeman of Cornell University, the only American contributor to the volume, argues that international administrative law "contains a wealth of material which can be utilized to guide international action" (p. 47). Professor Balakrishna of Madras University performs a useful service by calling attention to conditions now existing in underdeveloped countries which in all likelihood will "cause a progressive deterioration" in their economic status and to certain social prerequisites for economic change. The editor, in an interesting essay, stresses "two conflicting tendencies . . . in the international field, one of promoting constructive relations by developing more international strata, and another of promoting social and economic policies through State interference which intensifies the importance of vertical barriers" (p. 94). Professor K. A. N. Sastri of the University of Mysore presents some suggestive comments on "International Law and Relations in Ancient India." M. Ruthnaswamy, eminent Indian historian and former Vice-Chancellor of Annamalai University, deals with a very different subject, namely the international ideas of Leibnitz. Dr. U. R. Ehrenfels, now of Madras University, writes about war and human nature on the basis of his anthropological researches in India. Dr. J. D. N. Versluys, at present head of UNESCO's work in the social sciences in South Asia, discusses "Contradictory Tendencies in Indonesia," an area where he has had long experience. In his notes on the foreign policy of the People's Republic of China, Professor N. C. Bhattacharya of the Scottish Church College, Calcutta, expresses the opinion that the new regime in China is actively seeking to develop "associations with Asian countries, particularly India, so as to reduce the extent of her present dependence on the U.S.S.R." (p. 233). Among the many decisions which are digested by C. Keshava Rao the case of *Indian and General Investment Trust Ltd.* v. *Rajah of Khalikote* (A.I.R. 1952. Cal. 508), in particular, should be noted by specialists in private international law.

Professor C. H. Alexandrowicz and his associates of the University of Madras have shown commendable enterprise and skill in planning and producing a work of almost uniformly high quality. It should be of interest to all students of international affairs, in India and elsewhere.—NORMAN D. PALMER, *University of Pennsylvania.*

India in World Affairs, August 1947–January 1950: A Review of India's Foreign Relations from Independence Day to Republic Day. BY K. P. KARUNAKARAN. (Calcutta: Oxford University Press. 1952. Pp. xi, 407. Rs. 15.)

To meet the need for sound and objective studies of India's foreign policy, the Indian Council of World Affairs has decided to sponsor a series of volumes, to be issued periodically, on India in world affairs. The present volume, prepared by a Research Associate of the Council, is the first in this series. For the most part it is a sober and rather pedestrian account of the major problems and developments in international affairs with which India was particularly concerned during an eventful two and a half years. The author has examined the pertinent documents with painstaking care, and his brief summaries are often excellent. The book is in no sense a profound analysis of the mainsprings of India's foreign policy, although it contains useful chapters on "The Indian National Movement and World Affairs," "Factors in India's Foreign Policy," and "The Awakening of Asia in Recent Times." More than one-third of the volume deals with questions relating to the United Nations. The only other matters which are given detailed treatment are relations with Pakistan, racial discrimination in South Africa, and problems of external economic relations. On the whole the treatment is fair and objective; but the author presents some surprising interpretations of various aspects of American foreign policy, of the provisions of the UN Charter regarding non-self-governing territories, of the FAO, and of the early attempts to work out a program of assistance for underdeveloped countries. There are also several factual errors.

The manuscript of the present volume went to the press some two years prior to its publication. It is to be hoped that subsequent volumes in the series, some of which are already in preparation, will appear more promptly. The Indian Council of World Affairs should be congratulated for sponsoring a series that has been launched so auspiciously and that will make available significant background information for those who wish to probe more deeply into the factors shaping Indian foreign policy.—NORMAN D. PALMER, *University of Pennsylvania.*

Yankee Diplomacy: U. S. Intervention in Argentina. BY O. EDMUND SMITH, JR. (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press. 1953. Pp. iii, 196. Cloth $3.00, paper $2.00.)

This study, while essentially a history of U. S.-Argentine relations during World War II and the postwar period, strikes at the very heart of general hemispheric harmony. The U. S., in its militant determination to maintain the fiction of hemispheric solidarity upon a democratic base, not only played into the hands of the supernationalists in Argentina, but aroused the old suspicions of the Latin-American world in general and raised grave doubts concerning the sincerity of the U. S. as the Good Neighbor. By our coercive policy toward Argentina, we revived the long-laid ghost of "intervention," and in so doing violated the most cherished principle of inter-American cooperation—the doctrine of nonintervention.

As this volume makes unequivocably clear, the U.S., by its inconsistencies and pressure tactics, did a distinct disservice to hemispheric solidarity. Although our goals were commendable, we failed to exercise scrupulous care in the methods by which we attempted to attain them. The series of improvisations, of proddings and pin prickings, succeeded only in further exacerbating inter-American relations without seriously deterring the Argentine nationalists.

The reviewer is in general agreement with the thesis of the author, highly critical of U. S. policy as he is; but, as the author suggests, the time may be near when some collective inter-American action must be taken in cases of flagrant denial of fundamental human rights within a sister republic. The international community cannot long afford to ignore repeated violations of basic human rights, but the protection of such rights must be a community endeavor.

This volume, although well documented, regrettably has no index or bibliography.—Horace V. Harrison, *Emory University*.

Economic Planning for the Peace. By E. F. Penrose. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1953. Pp. xiv, 384. $7.50.)

The economic advisor to Ambassador Winant in London during the war traces the involved planning and political negotiations (primarily between the United Kingdom and the United States) leading up to raw materials controls, UNRRA, economic policies for occupied Germany, the projected ITO, the Bank and the Fund, etc. The result is a highly useful recapitulation that praises the major accomplishments but criticizes the failure to recognize the fundamental changes finally revealed by Europe's economic crisis of 1947.

The Year Book of World Affairs, 1953. Published under the Auspices of The London Institute of World Affairs. (London: Stevens & Sons, Ltd. 1953. Pp. xv, 427. £2 2s.)

The seventh volume in this series includes a dozen articles touching upon such diverse subjects as the cold war, British Africa, the Soviet Communist party, Indonesia, the underdeveloped areas, the Indian Constitution, and the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case.

International Politics: The Western State System in Mid-Century. By Frederick L. Schuman. (New York: McGraw-Hill Co. 1953. Pp. xvii, 577. $6.00.)

A fifth edition of this veteran text, considerably reduced in size although following the arrangement of earlier editions. Still pessimistic about man's ability to control himself, Professor Schuman offers world government or a return to the "Age of Reason" as alternatives to war, although the war may be indefinitely postponed inasmuch as modern weapons make "victory" for either side a doubtful prospect.

Traité de Droit international public: Avec mention de la pratique internationale et suisse. Tome I. By Paul Guggenheim. (Genève: Librairie de l'Université, Georg & Cie S.A. 1953. Pp. xxviii, 592.)

This is the first part of a two-volume textbook for Swiss students of public international law. The French edition is based on an earlier German edition published in 1948. The author is an adherent of the normative theory of law and of the monistic theory based on the primacy of international law. The outline of the first volume does not deviate in any substantial way from the usual arrangement followed in other European textbooks of public international law. Of main interest for the American reader are various references to Swiss practice.

Elements of American Foreign Policy. By Larry L. Leonard. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. 1953. Pp. xvi, 611. $6.00.)

A well-chosen collection of readings, many extremely timely, so arranged as to illustrate the constitutional issues, the policy-making process (executive, legislative and public), the evolution of U. S. policies, and the problems of the present day.

Foreign Relations of the United States: Diplomatic Papers, 1935. Volume I, General, The Near East and Africa. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1953. Pp. xcvii, 1074. $4.25.)

A volume of miscellany highlighted by the decline (after four years) of the Geneva Disarmament Conference, some interesting general reporting from European capitals, and the Italo-Ethiopian war.

Foreign Policies of the United States. By Hollis W. Barber. (New York: Dryden Press. 1953. Pp. ix, 614. $5.25.)

An introductory text that mixes some brief historical background with a broader discussion of events of the past two decades; nearly 200 pages is devoted to the United States and the United Nations.

The United States and India and Pakistan. By Norman W. Brown. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1953. Pp. x, 308. $4.50.)

Maintaining the high standards set by previous volumes in this series, Professor Brown has written an excellent and thorough introduction to the problems, politics, and internal development of these two South Asian countries, and with due regard to the religious backgrounds and the experience with British rule. Only one chapter is concerned specifically with U. S. relations.

America First: The Battle Against Intervention, 1940–1941. By Wayne S. Cole. (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press. 1953. Pp. xi, 305. $3.50.)

Interesting recent history—based on official records, press reports, private papers and interviews—of the organization and methods of the America First Committee around which were grouped the most vigorous opponents of U.S. intervention in World War II.

Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies: Instructions and Despatches, Volume I, 1816–1850; Volume II, 1850–1861. Edited by Howard R. Marraro. (New York: S. F. Vanni (Ragusa). 1952. Pp. xiv, 683; xxi, 781. $35.00.)

An obvious labor of love, these two volumes of official correspondence will be of interest to those concerned with early U. S. diplomacy or 19th century Italian history. A lengthy introduction sketches Italian-American relations up to the end of World War II.

Europe and the United States in the World Economy. By Robert Marjolin. (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press. 1953. Pp. xiv, 105. $2.00.)

Lectures delivered at Duke in 1951 by the Secretary General of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, reviewing the results of the Marshall Plan, the economic impact of the Korean war upon Europe, the problems of European integration, and U.S.-European economic relations.

Southeast Asia in the Coming World. Edited by Philip W. Thayer. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1953. Pp. xii, 306. $4.75.)

Papers presented to a 1952 Johns Hopkins conference on Southeast Asia by U.S. officials and scholars and by representatives of the area; economics, culture, law, and U.S. relations with the region are the topics emphasized.

Asia and the West. By Maurice Zinkin. (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations. 1953. Pp. xii, 304. $3.50.)

A slightly revised edition of a 1951 volume, sketching contemporary developments in all the Asian countries against the traditional social backgrounds and emphasizing the economic factor in the Asian "revolutions."

The Suez Canal in World Affairs. By Hugh J. Schonfield. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1953. Pp. x, 174. $4.50.)

More than a century of political and military activity over this vital waterway is described by a British writer, who points out the essential difficulty of reconciling Egypt's wish to control the canal with the commercial and military importance of the canal to certain other nations.

Germany Plots with the Kremlin. By T. H. Tetens. (New York: Henry Schuman, Inc. 1953. Pp. x, 294. $3.75.)

Using as his evidence excerpts from German newspapers, public and confidential statements of certain German groups, and other materials, the author claims that Germany is planning "a treacherous sell-out of Europe to Moscow" and pleads for an immediate re-examination of our basic policies on Germany. The author's conclusion is that, unless we can reach a reasonable settlement with Russia, the United States should remain in Germany until a new generation of Germans can be trusted or until we have made the other European powers strong enough to prevent the resurgence of aggressive German militarism without our help.

When Peoples Speak to Peoples: An Action

Guide to International Cultural Relations for American Organizations, Institutions, and Individuals. By Harold E. Snyder. (Washington: American Council on Education. 1953. Pp. xiii, 206. $3.00.)

Declaring that "international relations are human relations" and that international understanding can only follow cultural understanding, the author describes his work with the Commission for International Education and the Commission on the Occupied Areas, and offers suggestions for other agencies working in this field.

Wings for Peace: A Primer for a New Defense. By Bonner Fellers. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. 1953. Pp. 248. $3.50.)

A retired infantry general now views air power—as deterrent and as means of quick retaliation—as the main weapon in the United States' struggle to restrain the Soviet Union.

Strategy for Survival. By John E. Kieffer. (New York: David McKay Co. 1953. Pp. xiii, 306. $4.00.)

A former Georgetown lecturer, now an Air Force colonel, explains what must be done to defeat the enemy and to survive in World War III; complete with battle maps and plans for occupation.

U163.R 10

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

H. ARTHUR STEINER*

University of California (Los Angeles)

ARTICLES

International Politics and National Policies

General

Arnold, G. L. The Cold War. *Twentieth Century.* March and April, 1953.

Boitel, Michel. Situation et Problèmes Actuels de la Fonction Publique Internationale. *Politique Étrangère.* February–April, 1953.

Focsaneanu, Lazar. Les Conséquences Internationales des Nationalisations. *Politique Étrangère.* February–April, 1953.

Hertz, Frederick. Historical Understanding Between Nations. *Contemporary Review.* May, 1953.

Kallen, Horace M. Social Philosophy and the War of the Faiths. *Social Research.* Spring, 1953.

Lima, Alceu Amoroso. The University and the International Community. *Thought.* Spring, 1953.

Smith, Walter B. Practicalities of Power. *Department of State Bulletin.* May 11, 1953.

Tucker, Robert W. Faith, Reason, and Power Politics. [Review article.] *World Politics.* April, 1953.

United States

Auerbach, Frank L. The Visa Function under the Immigration and Nationality Act. *Department of State Bulletin.* May 4, 1953.

Cardozo, Michael H. Foreign Aid Legislation: Time for a New Look. *Cornell Law Quarterly.* Winter, 1953.

Cohen, Bernard C. Foreign Policy-making: Modern Design. [Review article.] *World Politics.* April, 1953.

Dulles, John Foster. The First 90 Days. *Department of State Bulletin.* April 27, 1953. The Making of Treaties and Executive Agreements. *Ibid.* April 20, 1953.

Knight, Ridgway B. U. S. Objectives in Western Europe. *Department of State Bulletin.* June 1, 1953.

Morton, Thruston B. At the Crossroads of U. S. Trade Policy. *Department of State Bulletin.* May 4, 1953.

Oppenheimer, J. Robert. Atomic Weapons and American Policy. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1953.

Reorganization of Foreign Aid and Information Programs. *Department of State Bulletin.* June 15, 1953.

Richardson, Channing B. The United States Mission to the United Nations. *International Organization.* February, 1953.

Rostow, W. W. Notes on a New Approach to U. S. Economic Foreign Policy. *World Politics.* April, 1953.

Steiner, H. Arthur. The United States and the Two Chinas. *Far Eastern Survey.* May, 1953.

---

* Prepared with the assistance of Mr. John H. Schaar.

Strange, *Major* Russell P. Atlantic Conference: The First Roosevelt-Churchill Meeting. *U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings.* April, 1953.

Latin America

Christensen, Asher N. *et al.* Latin America Today. [A Symposium] *Current History.* March, 1953.

Military Assistance to Latin America. *Department of State Bulletin.* March 30, 1953.

Puerto Rico's New Self-Governing Status. *Department of State Bulletin.* April 20, 1953.

Quintanilla, Luis. Pan Americanism and Democracy. Inter-American Monographs, No. 1. Boston University Press. 1952.

Rippy, J. Fred. British Investments in Latin America: A Sample of Profitable Enterprises. *Inter-American Economic Affairs.* Spring, 1953.

Commonwealth of Nations

Amery, Julian. A Conservative View of the Commonwealth. *Political Quarterly.* April–June, 1953.

Mansergh, Nicholas. The Commonwealth in Asia. *Behind the Headlines* (Toronto). March, 1953.

Munro, L. K. New Zealand and the New Pacific. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1953.

Pearson, L. B. Canada's Northern Horizon. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1953.

Younger, Kenneth. The United Nations and the British Commonwealth. *United Empire.* March–April, 1953.

Western and Central Europe

Alphand, Hervé. The "European Policy" of France. *International Affairs.* April, 1953.

Collins, Ellen. The Saarland; Key to European Unity. *World Affairs.* Summer, 1953.

de Bieville, Marc. Contribution Métropolitaine aux Dépenses de l'Union Française. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* March, 1953.

Die Neutraliteitspolitik en Zweden. *Internationale Spectator* ('s-Gravenhage). May 13, 1953.

East, W. Gordon. The Mediterranean: Pivot of Peace and War. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1953.

Fernsworth, Lawrence. Spain in Western Defense. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1953.

Furniss, Edgar S., Jr. French Attitudes toward Western European Unity. *International Organization.* May, 1953.

The Future of the Saar. *World Today.* May, 1953.

Germany and World Peace; A German Social Democratic View. *World Today.* April, 1953.

Harris, Chauncey D. and Wülker, Gabriele. The Refugee Problem of Germany. *Economic Geography.* January, 1953.

Marcusse, Ludwig. European Anti-Americanism. *Partisan Review.* May–June, 1953.

Marvaud, Angel. L'Actualité du Portugal. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* January and February, 1953.

Review of the Austrian Treaty Problem. *Department of State Bulletin.* June 8, 1953.

Schechtman, Joseph B. Postwar Population Transfers in Europe; A Survey. *Review of Politics.* April, 1953.

Von Schenck, E. La Suisse et l'Europe Naissante. *Monde Nouveau Paru.* No. 66, 1953.

U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe

Deutscher, Isaac. The Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. *International Affairs.* April, 1953.

Fedotov, George. The Fate of Empires. *Russian Review.* April, 1953.

Goodman, Elliot R. The Soviet Union and World Government. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1953.

Haffner, Sebastian. The Meaning of Malenkov. *Twentieth Century.* May, 1953.

Lissitzyn, O. J. Recent Soviet Literature on International Law. *American Slavic and East European Review.* December, 1952.

Morris, Bernard S. The Cominform; A Five-Year Perspective. *World Politics.* April, 1953.

Réflexions sur une Fédéralisation de l'Europe Danubienne. *Politique Étrangère.* December, 1952–January, 1953.

Rudzinski, Aleksander W. Soviet Peace Offensives. *International Conciliation.* April, 1953.

Middle East and Africa

Alexander, Mark. Middle Eastern Battleground. *Twentieth Century.* March, 1953.

Fartache, Manoutchehr. Le Développement Économique et les Problèmes Politiques du Moyen-Orient. *Politique Étrangère.* February–April, 1953.

Gardiner, Arthur Z. Problems of Trade with the Middle East. *Department of State Bulletin.* March 23, 1953.

Hargreaves, J. D. Idealism in African Politics. *Twentieth Century.* May, 1953.

Landau, Rom. Moroccan Profiles; A Nationalist View. *Middle East Journal.* Winter, 1953.

Liddell Hart, B. H. The Defense of the Middle East. *Harper's.* April, 1953.

Monroe, Elizabeth. Middle Eastern Contrasts: Egypt and Iraq. *International Journal.* Spring, 1953.

Pinon, René. Panislamisme et Offensive de l'Asie. *Revue des Deux Mondes.* April 1, 1953.

Sablier, Edouard. La Signification de l'Affaire du Pétrole Iranien. *Politique Étrangère.* February–April, 1953.

Shwadran, Benjamin. The Seventh United Nations Assembly and the Palestine Question. *Middle Eastern Affairs.* April, 1953.

Siegfried, André. The Suez: International Roadway. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1953.

Swanzy, Henry. French North Africa. *Twentieth Century.* May, 1953.

Varagnac, A. Construire l'Eurafrique. *Monde Nouveau Paru.* No. 66, 1953.

Pacific and Far East

Ballantine, Joseph W. The Future of the Ryukyus. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1953.

Braibanti, Ralph J. D. The Outlook for the Ryukyus. *Far Eastern Survey.* June, 1953.

Green, O. M. Whither Mao Tse-tung? *Fortnightly.* May, 1953.

Harper, Norman D. Pacific Security as Seen from Australia. *International Organization.* May, 1953.

Hornbeck, Stanley K. Korea—In Perspective. *World Affairs.* Summer, 1953.

Hudson, G. F. Will Britain and America Split in Asia? *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1953.

Lattimore, Owen. The New Political Geography of Inner Asia. *Geographical Journal.* March, 1953.

Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr. The Free World's Responsibility for Korean Reconstruction. *Department of State Bulletin.* March 23, 1953.

McAuley, James. Australia's Future in New Guinea. *Pacific Affairs.* March, 1953.

Meile, Pierre. Le Problème des États Himalayens. *Politique Étrangère.* December, 1952–January, 1953.

Quatrième Point contre Kominform Asiatique. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* March, 1953.

Silvain, Rene. Perspectives Nouvelles en Extrême-Orient. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* April, 1953.

Thompson, Elizabeth M. Status of Red China. *Editorial Research Reports.* April 28, 1953.

Wood, F. L. W. The Anzac Dilemma. *International Affairs.* April, 1953.

Southeast Asia.

Nguyen Van Tam. Les Réformes au Viêt-Nam. *Politique Étrangère.* December, 1952–January, 1953.

Tayyeb, Ali. Geo-Economic Trends in South Asia. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science.* August, 1952.

Thompson, Elizabeth M. War in Indo-China. *Editorial Research Reports.* April 3, 1953.

Colonial Policy

de Carbon, L. La Communauté Européene et les Territoires Dépendants. *Monde Nouveau Paru.* No. 66, 1953.

La Fédération de Rhodésie et du Nyasaland. *Chronique de Politique Étrangère.* January, 1953.

Pépy, D. Les Rapports entre l'Outre-Mer et la Communauté Européene. *Monde Nouveau Paru.* No. 68, 1953.

Thornton, A. P. Colonial Policy and Colonial Politics. *Fortnightly.* June, 1953.

International Economic Policy and Relations

Brown, William A., Jr. Sterling Convertibility and Some Related Problems. *American Economic Review.* May, 1953.

de la Fortelle, Robert. Les Problèmes Monétaires de l'Europe *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* March, 1953.

Gudin, Eugenio. Le Problème de l'Équilibre Économique International et les Tendances Actuelles du Fonds Monétaire International. *Politique Étrangère.* December, 1952–January, 1953.

Haberler, Gottfried. Reflections on the Future of the Bretton Woods System. *American Economic Review.* May, 1953.

Harrod, Roy F. Imbalance of International Payments. *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers.* April, 1953.

Hartland, Penelope. Private Enterprise and International Capital. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science.* February, 1953.

Lamb, Beatrice P. Trade—And Aid. *Public Affairs Pamphlet,* No. 195. April, 1953.

Leith-Ross, *Sir* Frederick. Sterling Convertibility. *South African Journal of Economics.* March, 1953.

Nakasian, Samuel. The Security of Foreign Petroleum Resources. *Political Science Quarterly.* June, 1953.

Neisser, Hans P. The United States Demand for Imports. *American Economic Review.* May, 1953.

Nelson, James R. and Palmer, Donald. United States Foreign Economic Policy and the Sterling Area. Center for International Studies, Princeton University. 1953.

Patel, I. G. Monetary Policy in Postwar Years. *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers.* April, 1953.

Tischendorf, Alfred P. British Investments in Latin American and African Mines; A Study of Contrasts. *Inter-American Economic Affairs.* Spring, 1953.

"A Trade and Tariff Policy in the National Interest"; Summary of the Bell Mission's Report. *Department of State Bulletin.* March 23, 1953.

International Law

Carlston, Kenneth S. Codification of International Arbitral Procedure. *American Journal of International Law.* April, 1953.

Dickinson, Edward D. The Law of Nations as Part of the National Law of the United States. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review.* Part II. April, 1953.

Downey, William G., Jr. The Law of War and Military Necessity. *American Journal of International Law.* April, 1953.

García-Mora, Manuel R. The Present Status of Political Offenses in the Law of Extradition and Asylum. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review.* Spring, 1953.

Gutteridge, J. A. C. The Repatriation of Prisoners of War. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* April, 1953.

Jones, Harry L. International Judicial Assistance Procedural Chaos and a Program for Reform. *Yale Law Journal.* March, 1953.

Naujoks, Herbert H. Compacts and Agreements between States and between States and a Foreign Power. *Marquette Law Review.* Winter, 1952–1953.

Pella, Vespasian V. The Question of the Creation of a Permanent International Criminal Court. *Revue de Droit International de Sciences Diplomatiques et Politiques.* January-March, 1953.

Reibstein, Ernst. Von Grotius zu Bynkershoek. *Archiv des Völkerrechts.* March, 1953.

Seidl-Hohenveldern, Ignaz. Rechtsbeziehungen zwischen Internationalen Organisationen und den Einzelnen Staaten. *Archiv des Völkerrechts.* March, 1953.

International Organization

United Nations and Specialized Agencies

Bailey, Gerald. The Seventh Assembly of UNO. *Contemporary Review.* April, 1953.

Chisholm, Brock. Barriers to World Health. *International Conciliation.* May, 1953.

Dawson, A. A. P. The United Nations and Full Employment. *International Labour Review.* May, 1953.

Eagleton, Clyde. Excesses of Self-Determination. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1953.

Haas, Ernest B. The Attempt to Terminate Colonialism; Acceptance of the United Nations Trusteeship System. *International Organization.* Feburary, 1953.

Leriche, Anthony. Les Langues Diplomatiques à l'Organisation des Nations Unies. *Revue de Droit International de Sciences Diplomatiques et Politiques.* January–March, 1953.

Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr. Maintaining Charter Standards for International Civil Servants. *Department of State Bulletin.* April 27, 1953. The United Nations: A Place to Promote Peace. *Ibid.* May 4, 1953.

Loftus, Martin L. The International Monetary Fund. 1951–1952; A Selected Bibliography. *International Monetary Fund Staff Papers.* April, 1953.

Marcovitch, Lazare. The Veto Power. *Revue de Droit International de Sciences Diplomatiques et Politiques.* January–March, 1953.

Mudaliar, *Sir* Arcot. World Health Problems. *International Conciliation.* May, 1953.

Rees, Elfan. The Refugee and the United Nations. *International Conciliation.* June, 1953.

Wood, Bryce. The Court, the Charter and the Secretariat; Recent Books on International Organization. *International Organization.* February, 1953.

Military and Security Questions

Bonnefous, Edouard. Communauté Européen et Pacte Atlantique. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* March, 1953.

Ismay, *Lord.* NATO: The Right Road to Peace. *Department of State Bulletin.* March 23, 1953.

Walton, Clarence C. Background for the European Defense Community. *Political Science Quarterly.* March, 1953.

Regional Organizations

Coblentz, William K. An Appraisal of the Schuman Plan. *American Bar Association Journal.* March, 1953.

de Bieville, Marc. Union Française et Communauté Européene. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* April, 1953.

Les Débuts de la Communauté Européen du Charbon et de l'Acier. *Chronique de Politique Étrangère.* January, 1953.

Frenay, H. Mars 1953 à Strasbourg. *Monde Nouveau Paru.* No. 68, 1953.

Motives and Methods of European Integration; a German Government View. *World Today.* April, 1953.

Mouskhély, Michel. Les Suppléants à l'Assemblée Consultative du Conseil de l'Europe. *Revue de Droit Publique et de la Science Politique en France et a l'Étrangère.* January–March, 1953.

Padover, Saul K. and Leonard, L. Larry. Europe's Quest for Unity. *Headline Series,* No. 97. 1953.

La Ratification du Traité Instituant la Communauté Européen du Charbon et de l'Acier. *Chronique de Politique Étrangère.* January, 1953.

Vernon, Raymond. The Schuman Plan. *American Journal of International Law.* April, 1953. Launching the European Coal and Steel Community. *Department of State Bulletin.* June 8, 1953.

DOCUMENTS

General and Miscellaneous

Council of Europe. Library and Documentation Center. Bibliographical and Documentary Information Bulletin No. 13. Strasbourg, March, 1953.

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Report. UN, 1953. (U.N. Doc. E/2360, 12 March 1953.)

International Court of Justice. Index to the Reports of Judgements, Advisory Opinions, and Orders. The Hague, 1952. (Sales No. 98.)

——— Reports of Judgements, Advisory Opinions, and Orders. The Minquiers and Ecrehos Case (United Kingdom/France). Order of 29 January 1953. The Hague, 1953. (Sales No. 99.)

Nathan Associates, Inc. Preliminary Report on Economic Reconstruction of Korea, Prepared for the United Nations Reconstruction Agency. Washington, 1952. (U. N. Doc. UNKRA/AG/13, 15 December 1952.)

Saar Government. Office of Information. The Saar: Key to European Unity. Saarbrucken, 1953.

United Kingdom. Central Office of Information. The Disarmament Question 1945–53. London, 1953.

——— Commonwealth Relations Office. Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Report by the Conference on Federation held in London in January, 1953. Cmd. 8753. London, H. M. Stationery Office, 1953.

World Health Organization. The Work of WHO in 1952: Annual Report of the Director General. . . . Geneva, 1953. (Official Records of the WHO, No. 45.)

United Nations

Economic and Social Council. Economic Development of Under-Developed Countries; Integrated Economic Development. Working Paper by the Secretary-General. UN, 1953. (Doc. E/2384, 25 March 1953.)

——— List of Inter-Governmental Organizations in the Economic and Social Fields, 1953 Edition. UN, 1953. (Doc. E/2361, 4 February 1953.)

——— Relations with Inter-Governmental Organizations. Report by the Secretary-General. UN, 1953. (Doc. E/2366, 17 February 1953.)

——— Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Annual Report . . . 9 February 1952 to 14 February 1953. UN, 1953. (Doc. E/CN.11/372, 14 February 1953.)

——— Economic Commission for Europe. The Commission's Programme of Work for 1953/1954. UN, 1953. (Doc. E/ECE/159, 27 January 1953.)

——— ——— Economic Survey of Europe Since the War. UN, 1953. (Doc. E/ECE/157, February, 1953.)

——— ——— Reports from the Committees . . . [of ECE] on Their Activities. UN, 1953. (Doc. E/ECE/153. 27 January 1953.)

——— Economic Commission for Latin America. A Study of Trade Between Latin America and Europe. . . . UN, 1953. (Sales No.: 1952. II. G.2, January, 1953.)

——— UNICEF. General Progress Report of the Executive Director. UN, 1953. (Doc. E/ICEF/221, 15 March 1953.)

General Assembly. Agent General of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency. Report . . . February 1951 to 15 September 1952. UN, 1952. (Doc. A/2222.)

——— International Law Commission. Second Report on the Regime of the Territorial

Sea, by J. P. A. François, Special Rapporteur. UN, 1953. (Doc. A/CN.4/61, 19 February 1953.)

Secretariat. Department of Public Information. Background Papers. No. 72: The India-Pakistan Question (Doc. ST/DPI/SER. A/72, 31 December 1952); No. 75: Disarmament (Doc. ST/DPI/SER. A/75, 20 February 1953.)

Secretary-General. World Economic Situation. Aspects of Economic Development in Africa. UN, 1953. (Doc. E/2377, 20 March 1953.)

United States

Congress. House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of the Special Study Mission to Pakistan, India, Thailand, and Indochina, . . . May 12, 1953. 83rd Congress, 1st Session. H. Rep. No. 130. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

——— Senate. Committee on Armed Services. Ammunition Supplies in the Far East. . . . Testimony by James A. Van Fleet and Others. . . . Hearings. . . . 83rd Congress, 1st Session. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

——— ——— Committee on Foreign Relations. Agreements Relating to the Status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Armed Forces, and Military Headquarters. Hearings . . . April 7 and 8, 1953. 83rd Congress, 1st Session. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

——— ——— ——— Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. Hearing . . . April 9, 1953. 83rd Congress, 1st Session. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

——— ——— ——— Report . . . to Accompany S. Res. 84, Remonstrating against Treatment of Minority Groups by Russia and Her Satellites. February 25, 1953. 83rd Congress, 1st Session, S. Rep. No. 47. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

——— ——— ——— Mutual Security Act of 1953. Hearings . . . May 5 . . . 29, 1953. Report . . . on S. 2128. 83rd Congress, 1st Session, S. Rep. No. 403, June 13, 1953. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

——— ——— ——— Overseas Information Programs of the United States. Report. . . . June 15, 1953. 83rd Congress, 1st Session, S. Rep. No. 406. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

——— ——— ——— St. Lawrence Seaway. Hearings on . . . S. 589 . . . April 14 . . . May 21, 1953. 83rd Congress, 1st Session. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

——— ——— ——— Seventh General Assembly of the United Nations. Report of Senator Alexander Wiley, February 25, 1953. 83rd Congress, 1st Session, S. Doc. No. 25. Report of Senator Theodore Francis Green, February 25, 1953. *Ibid.*, S. Doc. No. 27. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

——— ——— ——— Testimony of General Alfred M. Gruenther. Hearing . . . April 1, 1953. 83rd Congress, 1st Session. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

——— ——— Committee on Government Operations. State Department Information Program. Voice of America. Hearings . . . pursuant to S. Res. 40. 83rd Congress, 1st Session. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

——— ——— Committee on the Judiciary. Treaties and Executive Agreements. Hearings . . . on S. J. Res. 1 . . . and S. J. Res. 43. . . . February 18 . . . April 11, 1953. 83rd Congress, 1st Session. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

Department of the Interior. Office of Territories. Report on the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for the Period July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, Transmitted . . . to the United Nations pursuant to Article 88 of the Charter. . . . Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

Department of State. The Austrian Treaty: A Case Study of Soviet Tactics. Washington, G.P.O., 1953. (Pub. No. 5012.)

——— Greece: Strong Defenses at a Strategic Crossroad. Washington, G.P.O., 1953. (Pub. No. 5040.)

——— Military Assistance to Latin America. Washington, G.P.O., 1953. (Pub. No. 4917.)

——— Regional Organizations. . . . Europe and the North Atlantic Area. Washington, G.P.O., 1953. (Pub. No. 4944.)

——— Report on the Near East. Address by the Secretary of State June 1, 1953. Washington, G.P.O., 1953. (Pub. No. 5088.)

——— Report on the Operations of the Department of State (under Public Law 584). Message from the President. 83rd Congress, 1st Session. H. Doc., No. 115. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

High Commissioner for Germany. Report on Germany. September 21, 1949–July 31, 1952. . . . Cologne, 1952.

Mutual Security Agency. Economic Strength for the Free World. Report . . . by the Advisory Committee on Underdeveloped Areas. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

President. The Mutual Security Program for Fiscal Year 1954. Basic Data Supplied by the Executive Branch, May 5, 1953. [Committee Print]. Washington, G.P.O., 1953.

POLITICAL THEORY, RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY

Bolshevism: An Introduction to Soviet Communism. By Waldemar Gurian. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 1952. Pp. 189. $3.25.)

Professor Gurian's brief study sheds a great deal of light on the ideological aspects of Soviet Communism. The study consists of three chapters, comprising, together with the conclusion, 105 pages of text; in addition there is an extremely valuable appendix presenting one of the best brief collections of documents and source materials available on Soviet doctrine. The major thesis of the book, set forth systematically in the first chapter, but implicit throughout, is that Bolshevism is not merely a political and economic doctrine but a social and political religion. The author strongly suggests in the first chapter and explicitly states in his conclusion, that the utopianism inherent in Bolshevism must result in tyranny.

Many students may disagree with Professor Gurian in his explanation of Bolshevik totalitarianism, but few will fail to benefit from his penetrating analysis of the intellectual roots of Communist fanaticism and dynamism. One of the merits of his approach is that he brings out vividly the intolerant mood with which Lenin approached opponents, an attitude which has been retained by the Communists. This may seem an obvious point, but many otherwise excellent studies of Soviet politics have failed to achieve their maximum effect because they neglected these emotional and psychological aspects of the subject. It should be pointed out that, unlike many other writers, Gurian emphasizes the continuity of Bolshevism. In his view, Lenin and Stalin were orthodox Marxists, and Lenin was no more "humanitarian" than his even more literal-minded but perhaps more cunning successor.

Under the heading of the "Soviet Reality" of Bolshevism, Gurian presents a history of Bolshevist ideology and of the Soviet regime. Perhaps the most interesting part of this, the longest chapter in the book, is the material bringing out the peculiarly Russian aspects of Bolshevism. A great deal of insight and erudition is compressed into a short compass in this chapter. While the author is strongly anti-Communist, he does not make the common mistake of under-estimating either the power or the achievements of the Soviet regime. At the same time, he brings out forcefully the psychological and moral price paid for these achievements. One of the most interesting concepts advanced by Professor Gurian is that Bolshevik practice requires the creation of an "artificial reality" which is systematically and ruthlessly substituted for the knowledge which would result from freedom.

Throughout the book, but particularly in the last chapter entitled "Bolshevism as World Power," Gurian displays understanding of the circumstances which have enabled the rulers of the Kremlin to exert influence outside the borders of the U.S.S.R. He believes that the mythology of Soviet "anti-imperialist imperialism," with other aspects of the Soviet image as projected to the outside world, has won adherents not only because of the energy and skill with which it has been propagated, but also because this doctrine carried to its logical conclusions powerful currents of modern thought. In developing this concept, the author presents some very interesting comparisons between the Soviet and Nazi forms of totalitarianism. Professor Gurian's presentation of the world power of Bolshevism makes sobering reading. It is balanced at the end of the book by an expression of confidence. The author feels that by meeting the challenge of Communism, the non-Bolshevist world can sharpen its social conscience and improve itself.

Professor Gurian has made a valuable contribution to the literature on Soviet Communism. His study serves the double purpose of presenting effectively one of the major points of view from which Communism can be criticized, and of providing a highly readable introduction to the study of the Soviet system, particularly on the ideological side.—Frederick C. Barghoorn, *Yale University.*

The Dilemma of Democratic Socialism: Eduard Bernstein's Challenge to Marx. By Peter Gay. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1952. Pp. xvii, 334. $4.50.)

This is a very readable account of the life of Eduard Bernstein and the evolution of his thinking. It is disappointing, however, insofar as "the dilemma of democratic socialism" is concerned. Dr. Gay takes the position that both the Revisionists and their Marxist opponents were unduly dogmatic: the Revisionists were wrong in believing that the attainment of socialism is always possible by democratic parliamentary means, and the Marxists were wrong in insisting that socialism is never possible except by revolutionary means. He thinks that the Revisionist thesis was sound for England and unsound for Germany, and that the feasibility of socialism by democratic methods depends on the political structure of the state concerned. To the Marxist primacy of the economic, therefore, Dr. Gay opposes the primacy of the political.

Dr. Gay's analysis is disappointing in that it does not take into account the evolution of the economic goals of socialism since Bernstein's day. Socialism today differs from Marxism in much more than tactics, and that difference should vitally affect his diagnosis of the German situation.

Although this may not have been the author's intention, this book shows how far a man's ideology is from being governed by ideological considerations alone. It shows admirably how changes in position with regard to the truth of the opinions we hold are circumscribed and slowed down by a lifetime of associations and friendships, and how a man's reputation as a thinker and party leader is in the nature of an investment which is not lightly to be discarded. It was difficult and painful for Bernstein to readjust his opinions to bring them into line with the conclusions toward which facts and logic were drawing him, and so it is for all those who take their ideas seriously enough to affiliate themselves with movements committed to their realization.—RENE DE VISME WILLIAMSON, *University of Tennessee.*

Government Information and the Research Worker. Lectures Delivered at a Vacation Course of the University of London School of Librarianship and Archives in April 1951. EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY RONALD STAVELY. (London: Library Association. 1952. Pp. 228.)

The twenty-four papers by representatives of various ministries and other agencies stress in the main "publications and resources of their ministries that are likeliest to be of value to the specialist worker," and constitute in a way a guide to the official publications of the executive branch of the British government.—J.B.C.

Freedom and Authority in Our Time: Twelfth Symposium of the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion. EDITED BY LYMAN BRYSON, LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, R. M. MACIVER, AND RICHARD MCKEON. (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1953. Pp. xvi, 767. $6.00.)

Papers and discussion comments prepared by seventy-five program participants at the Twelfth Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion, held in New York City in September, 1951.

The Philosophy of J. S. Mill. BY R. P. ANSCHUTZ. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1953. Pp. 184. $3.00.)

A brief review and analysis of Mill's utilitarian and democratic philosophy and his system of logic.

The Substance of Politics. BY A. APPADORAI. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1953. Pp. x, 524. $2.50.)

Sixth edition—revised to take account of changes in recent years in India, France, Germany, Italy, and Newfoundland—of a comprehensive, concisely-written introduction to political science.

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON
POLITICAL THEORY

FRANCIS G. WILSON

University of Illinois

History and Criticism

Abel, Darrel. Hawthorne's Skepticism About Social Reform. *University of Kansas City Review.* Spring, 1953.

Adams, Arthur E. The Character of Pestel's Thought. *American Slavic and East European Review.* April, 1953.

Alfieri, V. E. I Due Aspetti della Teoria del Conoscere in Democrito. *Athanaeum.* 30/iii–iv. 1952.

Alföldi, Andreas. Die Geburt der Kaiserlichen Bildsymbolik. *Museum Helveticum.* April, 1953.

Almagro, Martín. La Dimensión Universalista de la Prehistoria. *Arbor.* March, 1953.

Baron, Hans. A Struggle for Liberty in the

Renaissance (II). *American Historical Review.* April, 1953.

Beharriell, Frederick J. Schnitzler's Anticipation of Freud's Dream Theory. *Monatshefte.* February, 1953.

Bestor, Arthur E., Jr. Patent-Office Models of the Good Society: Some Relationships between Social Reform and Westward Expansion. *American Historical Review.* April, 1953.

Betts, R. R. Some Political Ideas of the Early Czech Reformers. *Slavonic and East European Review.* December, 1952.

Bock, Hellmut. Common Sense als Lebenshaltung und Philosophie in England. *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen.* 189/2-3. 1953.

Böckmann, Paul. Die Bedeutung Nietzsches für die Situation der Modernen Literatur. *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte.* 79/1. 1953.

Bortolaso, G. Vincenzo Gioberti nel Centenario della Morte. *La Civilità Cattolica.* April 18, 1953.

Buck, August. Die Krise des Humanistischen Menschenbildes bei Machiavelli. *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen.* 189/4. 1953.

Chadbourn, Charles, C. Jr. Regent Curtis and His Crusade for the Ideals of Democracy. *New York History.* April, 1953.

Chadbourne, Richard M. Renan and Sainte-Beuve. *Romanic Review.* April, 1953.

Chevallier, Jean-Jacques. Jean-Jacques Rousseau ou l'Absolutisme de la Volonté Générale. *Revue Française de Science Politique.* January–March, 1953.

Cranz, F. Edward. Saint Augustine and Nicholas of Cusa in the Tradition of Western Christian Thought. *Speculum.* April, 1953.

Crook, J. A. Some Remarks on the Augustan Constitution. *Classical Review.* March, 1953.

Destler, Chester M. The Opposition of American Businessmen to Social Control During the "Gilded Age." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review.* March, 1953.

Ehrenberg, Victor. *Imperium Maius* in the Roman Republic. *American Journal of Philology.* April, 1953.

Farré, Luis. El Pensamiento de Santayana *Cuadernos Hispano-americanos.* December, 1952.

Figueres, Léo. Les Maîtres du Socialisme Scientifique et le Blanquisme. *Cahiers du Communisme.* April, 1953.

Fiorot, Dino. Sul Pensiero Filosofico di Jacques Robert Turgot. *Nuova Rivista Storica.* September–December, 1952.

Fitch, Robert E. John Dewey—The Last Protestant. *Pacific Spectator.* Spring, 1953.

Frisch, Morton. The Classical Attack on the French Revolution. *Classical Journal.* April, 1953.

Garaudy, Roger. Sur les Sources Françaises du Marxisme. *Cahiers du Communisme.* April, 1953.

Gomme, A. W. The Interpretation of ΚΑΛΟΙ ΚΑΓΑΘΟΙ in Thucydides 4.40.2. *Classical Quarterly.* January–April, 1953.

Hanke, Lewis. Bartolomé de las Casas, Existencialista? *Cuadernos Americanos.* March–April, 1953.

Harding, Joan N. Oscar Wilde and Ernest Renan. *Contemporary Review.* May, 1953.

Harris, Abram L. Veblen as Social Philosopher: A Reappraisal. *Ethics.* April, 1953.

Heller, Peter. Nihilist into Activist: Two Phases in the Development of Bertolt Brecht. *Germanic Review.* April, 1953.

Holmer, Paul L. Kierkegaard and Ethical Theory. *Ethics.* April, 1953.

Hours, Joseph. L'Idée Européenne et l'Ideal du Saint-Empire. *L'Année Politique et Economique.* January–March, 1953.

Irazusta, Julio. La Obra de Pereyra. *Estudios Americanos.* February, 1953.

Jacquot, J. Sébastien Castellion et l'Angleterre. *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance.* XV/I. 1953.

Jaeger, Werner. Alabanza de la Ley. Los Orígenes de la Filosofía del Derecho y los Griegos. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* January–February, 1953.

Keller, Abraham-Charles. Michel de l'Hopital and the Edict of Toleration of 1562. *Bibliothéque d'Humanisme et Renaissance.* XIV/2. 1952.

Knapp, Frank D., Jr. Parliamentary Government and the Mexican Constitution of 1857. *Hispanic American Historical Review.* February, 1953.

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. El Mito del Ateísmo Renacentista y la Tradición Francesa del Librepensamiento. *Notas y Estudios de Filosofiá.* January–March, 1953.

Leroy, Maxime. Augusto Comte y el Proletariado. *Cuadernos Americanos.* March–April, 1953.

Lopez, Robert S. An Aristocracy of Money in the Early Middle Ages. *Speculum.* January, 1953.

Low, J. M. A Regional Example of the Mercantilist Theory of Economic Policy. *Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies.* January, 1953.

Lukacs, Georg. Einführung in die Ästhetischen Schriften von Marx und Engels. *Sinn und Form.* V/I. 1953.

Magrath, Oswin. St. Thomas' Theory of Original Sin. *Thomist.* April, 1953.

Meadows, Paul. On the Dynamics of Power: A Case Study. *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly.* March, 1953.

Merlan, Philip. Abstractions and Metaphysics in St. Thomas' *Summa. Journal of the History of Ideas.* April, 1953.

Mercier, Roger. La Théorie des climats des "Reflexions Critiques" à "L'Esprit des Lois." *Revue d'Histoire Litteraire de la France.* January–March, 1953.

Miller, James W. The Development of the Philosophy of Socrates. *Review of Metaphysics.* June, 1953.

Miller, Perry. Emersonian Genius and the American Democracy. *New England Quarterly.* March, 1953.

Morrison, J. S. Xenophon, *Memorabilia* i.6: the Encounters of Socrates and Antiphon. *Classical Review.* March, 1953.

Morrow, Glenn R. Plato's Conception of Persuasion. *Philosophical Review.* April, 1953.

Negri, Guglielmo. La "Oceana" di Harrington nell 'Evoluzione Costituzionale Britannica. *Il Politico.* December, 1952.

Ostrander, Gilman M. Emerson, Thoreau, and John Brown. *Mississippi Valley Historical Review.* March, 1953.

Padover, Saul K. Madison as a Political Thinker. *Social Research.* Spring, 1953.

Pio Corrêa, M., Jr. O Bem-Estar Social na Antiguidade. *Revista do Serviço Público.* July, 1952.

Popkin, Richard H. Joseph Glanvil: Precursor of Hume. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* April, 1953.

Prothro, James W. Business Ideas and the American Tradition. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1953.

Pugh, George W. Historical Approach to the Doctrine of Sovereign Immunity. *Louisiana Law Review.* March, 1953.

Raumer, K. Von. Sully, Crucé und das Problem des Allgemeinen Friedens. *Historische Zeitschrift.* February, 1953.

Raven, J. E. Sun, Divided Line, and Cave [Plato]. *Classical Quarterly.* January–April, 1953.

Richardson, Walter C. British Fabianism Since 1914. *Thought.* Spring, 1914.

Rifkin, Lester H. Aristotle on Equality: Criticism of A. J. Carlyle's Theory. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* April, 1953.

Rinehart, Keith. John Stuart Mill's *Autobiography:* Its Art and Appeal. *University of Kansas City Review.* Summer, 1953.

Rossiter, Clinton. The Uses of Early American History. *Antioch Review.* Spring, 1953.

Rotenstreich, Nathan. Hegel's Image of Judaism. *Jewish Social Studies.* January, 1953.

Rouquette, Robert. The Evolution of the French Church. *Thought.* Spring, 1953.

Sarason, Bertram D. Edmund Burke and the Two *Annual Registers. PMLA.* June, 1953.

Schmitt, H. A. and Weston, J. C., Jr., Ten Letters to Edmund Burke. *Journal of Modern History.* March, 1953.

Schramm, Percy Ernst. Wie sahen die Mittelalterlichen Herrschaftszeichnen aus? *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte.* XXXV/I. 1953.

Shanahan, William O. The Social Outlook of Prussian Conservatism. *Review of Politics.* April, 1953.

Siguán, Miguel. Freud Desde Dentro. *Arbor.* April, 1953.

Silberner, Edmund. German Social Democracy and the Jewish Problem Prior to World War I. *Historia Judaica.* April, 1953.

Strémooukhoff, Dimitri. Moscow the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine. *Speculum.* January, 1953.

Sutton, Robert B. The Phrase *Libertas Philosophandi. Journal of the History of Ideas.* April, 1953.

Tooley, M. J. Bodin and the Mediaeval Theory of Climate. *Speculum.* January, 1953.

Villaseñor, Raúl. Luciano, Moro y el Utopismo de Vasco de Quiroga. *Cuadernos Americanos.* March–April, 1953.

Vucinich, Alexander. The First Russian State: An Appraisal of the Soviet Theory. *Speculum.* April, 1953.

Wandycz, Piotr S. The Polish Precursors of Federalism. *Journal of Central European Affairs.* January, 1953.

Westin, Alan Furman. The Supreme Court, the Populist Movement, and the Campaign of 1896. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1953.

Wevell, Basil H. Von. Die Sowjetunion und die Lehre A. T. Mahans. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik.* March, 1953.

Williams, Frank B., Jr. The Poll Tax as a Suffrage Requirement in the South, 1870–1901. *Journal of Southern History.* November, 1952.

Wolin, Sheldon S. Richard Hooker and English Conservatism. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1953.

Woodhouse, H. F. The Authenticity of

Hooker's Book VII. *Church History.* March, 1953.

Zall, Paul M. Lord Elden's Censorship. *PMLA.* June, 1953.

Zeitlin, Solomon. The Names Hebrew, Jew and Israel: A Historical Study. *Jewish Quarterly Review.* April, 1953.

Legal Theory and Public Law Issues

Chenot, Bernard. L'Existentialisme et le Droit. *Revue Française de Science Politique.* January–March, 1953.

Chroust, Anton-Hermann. The Philosophy of Law of the Epicureans. *Thomist.* April, 1953.

Connell, Francis J. Morality and Modern Marriage. *St. John's Law Review.* May, 1953.

Elorduy, P. Eleuterio. Orientaciones en la Interpretación de las Doctrinas Juridicas de Suárez. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* November–December, 1952.

Hutton, A. J. W. Usurpation of Political Power (An Analysis of the "Steel Seizure" Case). *Dickinson Law Review.* March, 1953.

Katz, Wilbur G. Responsibility and Freedom. *Journal of Legal Education.* 5/3. 1953.

Le Bras, Gabriel. Les Problèmes du Temps dans l'Histoire du Droit Canon. *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Etranger.* 30/4. 1952.

Quintano Ripolles, Antonio. Posibles Consecuencias Penales del Existencialismo. *Anuario de Derecho Penal y Ciencias Penales.* September–December, 1952.

Yankwich, Leon R. Aspects of Roman Civil Law. *Southern California Law Review.* April, 1953.

Special Study and Analysis

Aguilar Navarro, Mariano. Norteamérica, Democracia, Europa. *Estudios Americanos.* February, 1953.

Allemann, Fritz René. Le Systeme des Partis Politiques. *Documents.* April, 1953.

Andreae, Wilhelm. Freiheit und Gerechtigkeit in der Wirtschaft. *Neues Abendland.* May, 1953.

Armstrong, A. MacC. Contemporary Latin-American Philosophy. *Philosophical Quarterly.* April, 1953.

Arndt, Hans J. Demokratie und Aussenpolitik-Amerikas Democratisches Credo in der Feuerprobe. *Frankfurter Hefte.* April, 1953.

Aron, Raymond. Burnham et la Politique de Libération. *Preuves.* May, 1953.

——— En Quête d'une Philosophie de la Politique Étrangère. *Revue Française de Science Politique.* January–March, 1953.

———. The Diffusion of Ideologies. *Confluence.* March, 1953.

Bailey, Sydney D. Bolshevism and Nihilism. *Fortnightly.* March, 1953.

———. The Revision of Marxism. *Quarterly Review.* April, 1953.

Barbu, Z. Marxist Philosophy and European Thought. *Philosophical Quarterly.* April, 1953.

Barcia Trelles, Camilo. Mit Washington oder Moskau? *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik.* January, 1953.

Battershaw, Brian. The New American Revolution. *Dublin Review.* First Quarter, 1953.

Bendiner, Robert. The Liberals' Political Road Back. *Commentary.* May, 1953.

Borkenau, Franz. Stalinismus—und was Weiter? *Neues Abendland.* April, 1953.

Bowman, Ward S. Jr. Toward Less Monopoly. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review.* March, 1953.

Brown, Bernard. Morris Cohen's Search for Justice. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* April, 1953.

Brucculeri, A. Il Mito della Civiltà e del Progresso. *La Civiltà Cattolica.* March 7, 1953.

Carleton, William G. A More Responsible Party System? *Yale Review.* Spring, 1953.

Chen, Theodore Hsi-en and Chen, Wen-Hiu. The "Three-Anti" and the "Five-Anti" Movements in Communist China. *Pacific Affairs.* March, 1953.

Cohen, Felix S. Human Rights: An Appeal to Philosophers. *Review of Metaphysics.* June, 1953.

Communism [Various Articles.] *L'Age Nouveau.* February, 1953.

Conde, Francisco Javier. Introducción a la Antropología de Xavier Zubiri. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* January–February, 1953.

Conservative Party [Various Articles]. *Political Quarterly.* April–June, 1953.

Cook, Thomas I. and Moos, Malcolm. Hindrances to Foreign Policy: Individualism and Legalism. *Journal of Politics.* February, 1953.

Curran, Francis X. Protestant Parochial Schools. *Thought.* Spring, 1953.

Daniélou, J. Le Protestantisme dans des Voies Nouvelles? *Études.* May, 1953.

Delmas, Claude. De La Kleinstaaterei au Reich. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* April, 1953.

Drachkovitch, Milorad M. La Social-Démocratie et les Mouvements Totalitaires. *Cahiers de Bruges.* December, 1952.

Duclos, Jacques. La Lutte pour la Paix,

l'Independence Nationale, les Libertés Démocratiques et les Revendications Populaires. *Cahiers du Communisme.* March, 1953.

Edinger, Lewis J. German Social Democracy and Hitler's "National Revolution" of 1933: A Study in Democratic Leadership. *World Politics.* April, 1953.

Fagin, N. B. Dostoevsky's Underground Man Takes Over. *Antioch Review.* Spring, 1953.

Firebaugh, Joseph J. Freedom and the Humanities. *Educational Forum.* May, 1953.

Frankel, Charles. Empiricism and Moral Imperatives. *Journal of Philosophy.* April 23, 1953.

Frankl, Victor E. Logos and Existence in Psychotherapy. *American Journal of Psychotherapy.* January, 1953.

Geiger, George R. Dewey and the Experimental Attitude in American Culture. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* January, 1953.

Geiger, L. B. Metaphysique et Relativité Historique. *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale.* October–December, 1952.

Glicksberg, Charles I. Literary Existentialism. *Arizona Quarterly.* Spring, 1953.

Goodman, Elliot R. The Soviet Union and World Government. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1953.

Gould, Julius. Political Justice. *Cambridge Journal.* April, 1953.

Gray, J. Glenn. Heidegger Evaluates Nietzsche. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* April, 1953.

Gruhle, Hans W. Psychologie und Rechtswissenschaft. *Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staalswissenschaft.* 109/1. 1953.

Hambleton, George. The Essence of Freedom. *Dalhousie Review.* Winter, 1953.

Hamel, Walter. Die Bekenntnissfreiheit. *Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft.* 109/1. 1953.

Hand, Learned. Freedom and the Humanities. *American Association of University Professors Bulletin.* Winter, 1952–53.

Handcock, W. D. The Function and Nature of Authority in Society. *Philosophy.* April, 1953.

Haring, Douglas G. Japanese National Character: Cultural Anthropology, Psychoanalysis and History. *Yale Review.* Spring, 1953.

Haroutunian, Joseph. Christian Faith and Metaphysics. *Journal of Religion.* April, 1953.

Hazard, John N. A Political Testament for Stalin's Heirs. *International Journal.* Spring, 1953.

———. Soviet Property Law and Social Change. *British Journal of Sociology.* March, 1953.

Haer, John L. Conservatism and the Rural-Urban Continuum. *Rural Sociology.* December, 1952.

Hess, M. Whitcomb. Conant's Big-Business Fascism. *Catholic World.* April, 1953.

———. Subjectivism and the Superstate. *Catholic World.* May, 1953.

Hudson, G. F. Professor Toynbee Surrenders the West. *Commentary.* May, 1953.

Inge, W. R. Archaism and Futurism. *Philosophy.* April, 1953.

Jaeger, Hans. Neo-Faschismus in Deutschland. *Deutsche Rundschau.* 79/2. 1953.

Jaspers, Karl. Le Sens de l'Histoire. *La Table Ronde.* April and May, 1953.

Joannes, Victor. Le Travail Idéologique et Politique dans le Domaine de la Littérature et des Arts. *Cahiers du Communisme.* February, 1953.

Jolivet, R. Maurice Blondel et la Pensé Existentielle. *Études Philosophique.* 7/4. 1952.

Kallen, H. M. Social Philosophy and the War of the Faiths. *Social Research.* Spring, 1953.

Kirk, Russell. The Plight of American Minds and Hearts: Notes by an Anomic. *Sewanee Review.* Spring, 1953.

Kempski, Jürgen Von. Über den Liberalismus. *Merkur.* April, 1953.

Kennedy, Stetson and Kay. Le Travail Forcé aux États-Unis. *Les Temps Modernes.* March, 1953.

Koch, Adrienne. Toward an American Philosophy. *Virginia Quarterly Review.* Spring, 1953.

Kolb, William L. A Social-Psychological Conception of Human Freedom. *Ethics.* April, 1953.

Kroeber, A. L. The Delimitation of Civilizations. *Journal of the History of Ideas.* April, 1953.

Lavau, Georges E. Pourquoi les Français n'ont pas de Politique. *Esprit.* March, 1953.

Lefort, Claude. Le Marxisme et Sartre. *Les Temps Modernes.* April, 1953.

Lerner, S. Libertà di Culto e Ordine Pubblico. *La Civiltà Cattolica.* March 21, 1953.

Letwin, Shirley Robin. Utilitarianism: A System of Political Tolerance. *Cambridge Journal.* March, 1953.

Lewis, Gordon K. America and the New

British Radicalism. *Western Political Quarterly.* March, 1953.

Löwith, Karl. Heideggers Auslegung des Ungesagten in Nietzsches Wort "Gott is Tot." *Die Neue Rundschau.* 64/1. 1953.

Matl, Josef. Economia, Sociedad y Cultura del Sovietismo. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* November–December, 1953.

Megay, Edward N. Lysenkoism and the Stateless Society. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1953.

Meland, Bernard E. Interpreting the Christian Faith within a Philosophical Framework. *Journal of Religion.* April, 1953.

Miller, J. A Political Economy of Socialism in the Making. *Soviet Studies.* April, 1953.

Mitscherlich, Alexander. Massenpsychologie ohne Ressentiment. *Die Neue Rundschau.* 64/1. 1953.

Mothershead, John L., Jr. Freedom of the Mind and American Higher Education. *Educational Record.* January, 1953.

Murray, J. C. L'Eglise et la Democratie Totalitaire. *La Vie Intellectuelle.* April, 1953.

Murray, R. J. K. An Analysis of Society. *Philosophy.* April, 1953.

Murillo, Ferrol, F. Consideraciones sobre la Democracia. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* November–December, 1952.

Neumann, Franz L. Zum Begriff der Politischer Freiheit. *Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft.* 109/1. 1953.

Nixon, Charles R. Freedom vs. Unity: A Problem in the Theory of Civil Liberty. *Political Science Quarterly.* March, 1953.

Paniker, Raimundo. El Patriotismo Cristiano. *Estudios Amercanos.* March, 1953.

Pende, Nicola. Biopsicologia e Politica. *Nuova Antologia.* April, 1953.

Perry, Ralph Barton. What Does it Mean to be Free? *Pacific Spectator.* Spring, 1953.

Radkey, Oliver H. An Alternative to Bolshevism: The Program of Russian Social Revolutionism. *Journal of Modern History.* March, 1953.

Ramiro Rico, Nicolás. La Soberanía. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* November–December, 1952.

Redlich, Fritz. The Business Leader as a "Daimonic" Figure. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* January, 1953.

Richter, Hans. Die Parteien im Demokratischen Staat. *Deutsche Rundschau.* 79/3. 1953.

Robinson, Dwight E. Economics and "the Possibility of Civilization"; Four Judgments. *Quarterly Journal of Economics.* February, 1953.

Röpke, Wilhelm. Die Freier der Penelope. *Deutsche Rundschau.* 79/4. 1953.

Rossi, A. Théorie des Démocraties Populaires. *Preuves.* May, 1953.

Schürch, Ernst. Der Internationale Kommunismus von Innen Betrachtet. *Neue Schweizer Rundschau.* April, 1953.

Sessions, Robert E. The Modern Mind in Management. *Current Economic Comment.* May, 1953.

Siegfried, André. Philosophie de la Publicité. *La Revue de Paris.* April, 1953.

Schlesinger, Arthur, Jr. The Highbrow in American Politics. *Partisan Review.* March–April, 1953.

Schmaus, Michael. Continuidad y Progreso en el Cristianismo. *Cuadernos Hispano-americanos.* December, 1952.

Schneider, Frederick D. Collingwood and the Idea of History. *University of Toronto Quarterly.* January, 1953.

Schwartz, Edward. Eliot's *Cocktail Party* and the New Humanism. *Philological Quarterly* January, 1953.

Schweinitz, Karl de, Jr. Free Enterprise and Democracy. *Social Research.* Spring, 1953.

Seyppel, Joachim H. A Comparative Study of Truth in Existentialism and Pragmatism. *Journal of Philosophy.* April 9, 1953.

Sperber, Manes. Idéologie et Société. *Preuves.* April and May, 1953.

Swanson, G. E. The Approach to a General Theory of Action by Parsons and Shil. *American Sociological Review.* April, 1953.

Tauber, Kurt P. The Free University in an Open Society. *Harvard Educational Review.* Winter, 1953.

Torres Martinez, Manuel de. El Futuro de la Política Social. *Cuadernos de Política Social.* No. 16, 1952.

Toynbee, Arnold J. Weltgeschichte in Universaler Schau. *Universitas.* April, 1953.

Tucker, Robert W. Faith, Reason, and Power Politics [Niebuhr]. *World Politics.* April, 1953.

Utley, T. E. Majority Rule. *Fortnightly.* April, 1953.

Valdeiglesias, Marqués de. La Revolución Conservadora en Alemania. *Revista de Estudios Políticos.* January–February, 1953.

Vecchio, Giorgio del. Die Zwecke des Staates und der Rechtsstaat. *Universitas.* March, 1953.

Voegelin, Eric. The Oxford Political Philosophers. *Philosophical Quarterly.* April, 1953.

Wagener, Maja. The Formation of the Masses as One Origin of Totalitarianism. *Cahiers de Bruges.* December, 1952.

Wolf, Georg. Psychoanalyse als Ideologie. *Deutsche Rundschau.* 79/3. 1953.

Wright, David M. Democracy and Economics in American Ideology. *Confluence.* March, 1953.

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

HERBERT A. SIMON
Carnegie Institute of Technology

Philosophy of Social Science

Costa, A. Massucco. Le Applicazioni in Pedagogia e in Politica della Dottrina di K. Lewin. *Il Politico.* April, 1953.

Deutsch, Karl W. On Communication Models in the Social Sciences. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1952.

Gini, Corrado. Intorno all'uso dei Modelli nelle Scienze. *Rivista di Politica Economica.* January, 1953.

Oppenheim, Felix E. Rational Choice. *Journal of Philosophy.* June 4, 1953.

Perryman, J. N. On the Meaning of "Democracy." *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Spring, 1953.

Tustin, A. Do Modern Mechanisms Help us to Understand the Mind? *British Journal of Psychology.* February, 1953.

Research Methods and Organization

Katz, Leo. A New Status Index Derived from Sociometric Analysis. *Psychometrika.* March, 1953.

Mann, Floyd and Likert, Rensis. The Need for Research on the Communication of Research Results. *Human Organization.* Winter, 1952.

Social Relations Skills in Field Research. *Journal of Social Issues.* 1952. #3 (whole number).

Symposium: Reliability and Usability of Soviet Statistics. *American Statistician.* April–May, 1953.

Motivation and Personality

Harvey, John. The Content Characteristics of Best-Selling Novels. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Spring, 1953.

Jahoda, Gustav. Social Class Attitudes and Levels of Occupational Aspiration in Secondary Modern School Leavers. *British Journal of Psychology.* May, 1953.

Kerlinger, Fred N. Behavior and Personality in Japan. *Social Forces.* March, 1953.

Kolb, William L. A Social-Psychological Conception of Human Freedom. *Ethics.* April, 1953.

Mandelbaum, David G. On the Study of National Character. *American Anthropologist.* April–June, 1953.

Miroglio, Abel. Le Discernement de L'Objet dans les Études de Psychologie des Peuples. *Revue de Psychologie des Peuples.* 1952, #4.

Mishler, Elliot G. Personality Characteristics and the Resolution of Role Conflicts. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Spring, 1953.

Reissman, Leonard. Levels of Aspiration and Social Class. *American Sociological Review.* June, 1953.

Scodel, Alvin and Mussen, Paul. Social Perceptions of Authoritarians and Non-Authoritarians. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* April, 1953.

Smith, M. Brewster. Conference on Nonintellective Determinants of Achievement. *Items.* June, 1953.

Smith, Patricia Cain. The Curve of Output as a Criterion of Boredom. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* April, 1953.

Opinions and Attitudes

Case, Herman M. Guttman Scaling Applied to Centers' Conservatism-Radicalism Battery. *American Journal of Sociology.* May, 1953.

Congalton, A. A. Social Grading of Occupations in New Zealand. *British Journal of Sociology.* March, 1953.

Krugman, Herbert E. The Appeal of Communism to American Middle Class Intellectuals and Trade Unionists. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1952.

Leiserson, Avery. Notes on the Theory of Political Opinion Formation. *American Political Science Review.* March, 1953.

Lipset, S. M. Opinion Formation in a Crisis Situation. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Spring, 1953.

Miller, Warren E. Party Preference and Attitudes on Political Issues: 1948–51. *American Political Science Review.* March, 1953.

Steiner, Ivan D. Some Social Values Associated with Objectively and Subjectively Defined Social Class Memberships. *Social Forces.* May, 1953.

Taft, Ronald. The Shared Frame of Reference Concept Applied to the Assimilation of Immigrants. *Human Relations.* 1953, #1.

Tannenbaum, Percy H. The Effect of Headlines on the Interpretation of News Stories. *Journalism Quarterly.* Spring, 1953.

Weiss, Walter. A "Sleeper" Effect in Opinion Change. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* April, 1953.

Group Behavior

Banerjee, D. N. Political Ideologies and Political Behaviour. *Modern Review* (Calcutta). December, 1952.

Berkowitz, Leonard. Sharing Leadership in Small, Decision-Making Groups. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* April, 1953.

Cohen, John. Study of Committees and Conferences. *Public Administration.* Winter, 1953.

Comrey, Andrew L.; Pfiffner, John M.; and Beem, Helen P. Factors Influencing Organizational Effectiveness, II. The Department of Employment Survey. *Personnel Psychology.* Spring, 1953.

Cook, P. H. and Wyndham, A. J. Patterns of Eating Behavior: A Study of Industrial Workers. *Human Relations.* 1953, #2.

Green, James W. and Mayo, Selz C. A Framework for Research in the Actions of Community Groups. *Social Forces.* May, 1953.

Haythorn, William. The Influence of Individual Members on the Characteristics of Small Groups. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* April, 1953.

Jackson, Jay M. The Effect of Changing the Leadership of Small Work Groups. *Human Relations.* 1953, #1.

Jaques, Elliott. On the Dynamics of Social Structure. *Human Relations.* 1953, #1.

Kobre, Sidney. How Florida Dailies Handled the 1952 Presidential Campaign. *Journalism Quarterly.* Spring, 1953.

Kunnath, Jerome G. and Kerr, Willard A. Function Analysis of Thirty-Two American Corporate Boards. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* April, 1953.

Langrod, Georges. Line, Staff, Auxiliary Services. *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives.* 1952, #3.

Maccoby, Nathan and Hymovitch B. The Effects of Rank on Human Relations. *Air University Quarterly Review.* Winter, 1952–53.

Maier, Norman R. F. An Experimental Test of the Effect of Training on Discussion Leadership. *Human Relations.* 1953, #2.

Miller, Mungo. The Waukegan Study of Voter Turnout Prediction. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1952.

Perlmutter, Howard V. Group Memory of Meaningful Material. *Journal of Psychology.* April, 1953.

Pfiffner, John M. Research in Organization Effectiveness. *Public Personnel Review.* April, 1953.

Sheets, Alfred. Member Participation and Consumer Cooperatives. *Sociology and Social Research.* September–October, 1952.

Showel, Morris. Political Independence in Washington State. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1952.

Stokes, William S. Violence as a Power Factor in Latin-American Politics. *Western Political Quarterly.* September, 1952.

Story, M. L. Defining the Administrative Function. *Journal of Educational Research.* January, 1953.

Strauss, George and Sayles, Leonard R. Occupation and the Selection of Local Union Officers. *American Journal of Sociology.* May, 1953.

Suchman, Edward A. Socio-Psychological Factors Affecting Predictions of Elections. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1952.

Sykes, Gresham. The Structure of Authority. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Spring, 1953.

Theodorson, George A. Elements in the Progressive Development of Small Groups. *Social Forces.* May, 1953.

Willerman, Ben and Swanson, Leonard. Group Prestige in Voluntary Organizations: A Study of College Sororities. *Human Relations.* 1953, #1.

Wyatt, S. A Study of Output in Two Similar Factories. *British Journal of Psychology.* February, 1953.

Culture and Institutions

Barlowe, Raleigh. Land Reform and Economic Development. *Journal of Farm Economics.* May, 1953.

Berelson, Bernard. Democratic Theory and Public Opinion. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1952.

Boskoff, Alvin. Postponement of Social Decision in Transitional Society. *Social Forces.* March, 1953.

Carlin, Edward A. Intangible Property as a Tool for Analyzing the Relationships Between Government and Private Enterprise. *Quarterly Journal of Economics.* February, 1953.

Centers, Richard. Social Class, Occupation, and Imputed Belief. *American Journal of Sociology.* May, 1953.

Cony, Edward R. Conflict-Cooperation Content of Five American Dailies. *Journalism Quarterly.* Winter, 1952.

Grossack, Martin. A Study of Attitudes Toward American Policy in Germany. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Fall, 1952.

Halsey, A. H. and Gardner, L. Selection for Secondary Education and Achievement in Four Grammar Schools. *British Journal of Sociology.* March, 1953.

Hazard, John N. Soviet Property Law and Social Change. *British Journal of Sociology.* March, 1953.

Hope, John, II. Industrial Integration of Negroes: The Upgrading Process. *Human Organization.* Winter, 1952.

Papi, Giuseppe Ugo. Pianificazione Economica in Regime Democratico. *Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia.* November–December, 1952.

Prothro, E. T. and Melikian, L. Social Distance and Social Change in the Near East. *Sociology and Social Research.* September–October, 1952.

Schulz, T. and Wiles, P. Earnings and Living Standards in Moscow. *Bulletin of the Oxford University Institute of Statistics.* September–October, 1952.

Siegfried, André. La Psychologie des Relations Anglo-Allemandes. *Revue de Psychologie des Peuples.* 1952, #4.

Staats, Elmer B. The Government Sector of the American Economy. *American Political Science Review.* March, 1953.

Value Theory and Social Policy

Burkhead, Jesse. Changes in the Functional Distribution of Income. *Journal of American Statistical Association.* June, 1953.

Frankel, Charles. Empiricism and Moral Imperatives. *Journal of Philosophy.* April 23, 1953.

Jarman, T. L. Dilemma in Modern Education. *National and English Review.* January, 1953.

Koivisto, W. A. Value, Theory, and Fact in Industrial Sociology. *American Journal of Sociology.* May, 1953.

Peacock, Alan T. Theory of Population and Modern Economic Analysis. *Population Studies.* November, 1952.

de Schweinitz, Karl, Jr. Free Enterprise and Democracy. *Social Research.* Spring, 1953.

Shepherd, Geoffrey. What Should Go Into the Parity Price Formula? *Journal of Farm Economics.* May, 1953.

Singer, H. W. Obstacles to Economic Development. *Social Research.* Spring, 1953.

Steer, W. S. Measuring the Public Services. *Public Administration.* Winter, 1952.

Steiner, Jesse F. Japan's Post-War Population Problems. *Social Forces.* March, 1953.

Walhout, Donald. Objectivity and Value. *Journal of Philosophy.* May 7, 1953.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

BOWEN, E. R. *The Cooperative Road to Abundance: The Alternative to Monopolism and Communism.* New York: Henry Schuman. 1953. Pp. xiii, 169. $3.00.

BOYD, JULIAN P. (ED.), BUTTERFIELD, LYMAN H. AND BRYAN, MINA R. (ASSOC. EDS.). *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Vol. 5: 25 February 1781 to 20 May 1781. Vol. 6: 21 May 1781 to 1 March 1784.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1952. Pp. xxxv, 705; xxxvi, 684. $10.00; $10.00.

BOYLE, GEORGE. *Father Tompkins of Nova Scotia.* New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1953. Pp. xii, 234. $3.00.

BRYSON, LYMAN (ED.). *Facing the Future's Risks: Studies Toward Predicting the Unforeseen.* New York: Harper and Brothers. 1953. Pp. viii, 318. $4.00.

BÜHLER, OTTMAR, NEUMARK, FRITZ, AND LADEMANN, FRITZ. *Internationaler Steuerbelastungsvergleich. Band II.* Frankfort a.M.: Verlag für Geschichte und Politik. 1952. Pp. 178.

CRAVEN, WESLEY FRANK AND CATE, JAMES LEA (EDS.). *The Army Air Forces in World War II. Volume Five: The Pacific: Matterhorn to Nagasaki, June 1944 to August 1945.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1953. Pp. xxxvii, 878. $8.50.

EATON, JOHN. *Economics of Peace and War:*

An Analysis of Britain's Economic Problems. New York: International Publishers. 1953. Pp. 112. $1.50.

EBERDT, MARY LOIS AND SCHNEPP, GERALD J. *Industrialism and the Popes.* New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1953. Pp. xxii, 245. $3.50.

FERNET, VICE-AMIRAL. *Aux Côtés du Maréchal Pétain: Souvenirs (1940–1944).* Paris: Librairie Plon. 1953. Pp. vii, 309.

FOURASTIÉ, JEAN. *Le Grand Espoir du XX^e Siecle.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. 1952. Pp. xxviii, 245. 560 fr.

GALBRAITH, W. O. *Colombia: A General Survey.* New York: Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1953. Pp. vii, 140. $2.50.

GEMMELL, JAMES AND BALSLEY, HOWARD L. *Principles of Economics.* Boston: D. C. Heath and Co. 1953. Pp. xiii, 589. $4.75.

GOLDMAN, ERIC F. *Rendezvous with Destiny: A History of Modern American Reform.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1952. Pp. xlv, 503. $5.00.

HARDER, LELAND AND HARDER, MARVIN. *Plockhoy from Zurik-Zee: The Study of a Dutch Reformer in Puritan England and Colonial America.* Newton, Kansas: Board of Education and Publication, General Conference Mennonite Church. 1952. Pp. x, 255.

HART, B. H. LIDDELL (ED.). *The Rommel Papers.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co. 1953. Pp. xxx, 545. $6.00.

HERZFELD, HANS (REVISED BY). *Die Moderne Welt: 1789–1945. II. Teil: 1890–1945.* Braunschweig: Georg Westermann. 1952. Pp. viii, 392.

JOHNSON, F. ERNEST (ED.). *American Education and Religion: The Problem of Religion in Schools.* New York: Harper and Brothers. 1953. Pp. ix, 211. $2.00.

MCCORMICK, ROBERT R. *The American Empire.* Chicago: Chicago Tribune. 1952. Pp. 120. $2.50.

MCNALL, EDWARD. *David Starr Jordan: Prophet of Freedom.* Stanford: Stanford University Press. 1953. Pp. viii, 243. $5.00.

MEDIGER, WALTHER. *Moskaus Weg Nach Europa: Der Aufsteig Russlands zum Europäischen Machtstaat im Zeitalter Friedrichs des Grossen.* Braunschweig: Georg Westermann. 1952. Pp. xv, 744.

MEDLIN, WILLIAM-KENNETH. *Moscow and East Rome: A Political Study of the Relations of Church and State in Muscovite Russia.* Neuchatel, Switzerland: Delachaux et Niestlé. 1952. Pp. xv, 252.

MINER, HORACE. *The Primitive City of Timbuctoo.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1953. Pp. xix, 297. $5.00.

NAFTALIN, ARTHUR, NELSON, BENJAMIN N., SIBLEY, MULFORD Q., AND CALHOUN, DONALD C. (SELECTED, WRITTEN, AND EDITED BY), PAPANDREOU, ANDREAS G. (ASST.). *An Introduction to Social Science: Personality, Work, Community.* Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1953. Pp. xlvii, 373.

PARKES, HENRY BAMFORD. *The United States of America: A History.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1953. Pp. xlv, 773. $5.75.

POUND, ROSCOE. *The Lawyer from Antiquity to Modern Times with Particular Reference to the Development of Bar Associations in the United States.* St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co. 1953. Pp. xxxii, 404. $5.00.

SEELY, CHARLES S. *Philosophy and the Ideological Conflict: An Analysis of Idealism and Materialism and the Influence of These Philosophies on the Over-All World Struggle between Capitalism and Socialism.* New York: Philosophical Library. 1953. Pp. vii, 319. $5.00.

SOMERVELL, D. C. *Modern Britain: 1870–1950.* London: Methuen and Co. Ltd. Distributed by the British Book Centre, New York. 1953. Pp. ix, 266. $2.75.

THOMSON, S. HARRISON. *Czechoslovakia in European History.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. 2nd ed. 1953. Pp. x, 485. $7.50.

TIMMONS, BASCOM N. *Portrait of an American: Charles Gates Dawes.* New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1953. Pp. vi, 344. $5.00.

UNITED NATIONS: ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST. *Mobilization of Domestic Capital in Certain Countries of Asia and the Far East.* New York: Columbia University Press. 1951. Pp. xii, 239. $1.50.

VON MISES, LUDWIG. *The Theory of Money and Credit.* New Haven: Yale University Press. New edition. 1953. Pp. ix, 493. $5.00.

WORCESTER, DEAN A., JR. *Fundamentals of Political Economy.* New York: Ronald Press Co. 1953. Pp. xv, 594. $4.50.

WORKING PARTY FOR THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT. *The Economic Development of Mexico.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1953 Pp. xxiv, 392. $10.00.

NEWS AND NOTES

PROFESSIONAL CONFERENCES

The International Political Science Association, in conjunction with a meeting of its executive committee, sponsored a Round-table Conference on Comparative Public Administration in Paris, June 10–12, organized by Taylor Cole of Duke University. At a session on "New Areas for Research in Public Administration," Dean Edward H. Litchfield of Cornell University and Charles S. Ascher of the Public Administration Clearing House presented the current thought of a subcommittee on comparative administration of the committee on public administration of the American Political Science Association and the results of the Conference on Comparative Administration convened by Public Administration Clearing House in September, 1952. Other political scientists taking part from the United States were: Mrs. Jane Clark Carey, now resident in Rome; Carl J. Friedrich, Harvard University; and John A. Vieg, Pomona College. About twenty-five participated, including political scientists from Brazil, India, and Israel, as well as Western Europe.

The New England Political Science Association held its annual meeting at Amherst College, May 9, 1953, with an estimated 125 in attendance. The morning session discussed "National Interest as a Goal in International Relations," with a panel comprising Professors Earl Latham, Amherst College, chairman; Arnold Wolfers, Yale University; Karl Loewenstein, Amherst College; Sigmund Neumann, Wesleyan University; Alan Burr Overstreet, Smith College; McGeorge Bundy, Harvard University; and Daniel Cheever, Harvard University. The panel in the afternoon session on "The Role of Public Opinion in the Making of Foreign Policy" consisted of Professors Robert Dahl, Yale University, chairman; Ruth Lawson, Mount Holyoke College; Walter Filley, Wesleyan University; and John Wahlke, Amherst College. The following officers were elected for 1953–1954: Professor Earl Latham, Amherst College, president; Professor Andrew Nuquist, University of Vermont, vice-president; Professor Donald Matthews, Smith College, secretary-treasurer; The Rev. George A. Higgins, Holy Cross, Professor Athern Dagget, Bowdoin, Professor Lowell Field, University of Connecticut, members of the executive council.

The Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Midwest Conference of Political Scientists was held May 7–9 at Michigan State College with an attendance of 261 persons. The theme of the conference was "Group Relations in the Political Process," which was the topic of the address by David B. Truman of Columbia University at the opening general session. Pendleton Herring, President of the American Political Science Association, addressed a luncheon meeting on the activities and plans of the Association. A general round table on the subject "Is Pressure Group Activity Contrary to the Public Interest?" was also included in the program. Sectional round-table discussions were held on the following topics: "Theory of Group Relations," "Methods and Techniques in the Area of Parties, Elections and Public Opinion," "Influence of Organized Groups on Foreign Policy," "Groups in Federal-Municipal Relations," and "The Law and Its Relationship to Social Groups." The officers selected by the conference included: Harry W. Voltmer of DePauw University, president; Jasper B. Shannon of the University of Kentucky, vice-president; A. LeRoy Bennett of Michigan State College, secretary-treasurer; Wilfred E. Binkley of Ohio Northern University and Rudolph E. Morris of Marquette University, members of the executive council. The 1954 meeting of the Conference will be held at the University of Iowa, April 29 through May 1.

The Western Political Science Association met on March 30 and 31, on the campus of the University of Southern California. The following are the Association's newly elected officers: president, John Swarthout, Oregon State College; vice-president, Herman Trachsel, University of Wyoming; council members: Paul Hadley, University of Southern California; Egbert Wengert, University of Oregon; Curtis Martin, University of Colorado; and Totton J. Anderson, ex-officio. Officers retaining their positions for another year include secretary-treasurer Allan R. Richards, University of New Mexico, and council members Thomas Barclay, Stanford University; M. R. Merrill, Utah State Agricultural College; and Hugh A. Bone, University of Washington. In 1954 the Association will hold a joint meeting with the Pacific Northwest Political Science Association at Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oregon. The Association amended its constitution to provide that the retiring president will serve in an ex-officio capacity on the executive council for a one-year period.

The Sixth Annual Meeting of the Pacific Northwest Political Science Association was held at the University of Washington, April 10–11, 1953. "Research and Revaluation" was the general theme of the meeting, which gave attention to revised policies under the new Administration. Four round tables were devoted to the following subjects: "Sectional and Economic Aspects of American Foreign Policy," "Political Characteristics of the Pacific Northwest: A Challenge to Research," "Conservatism Revisited," and "Natural Resources Research." New officers elected for 1953–54 are: Maure L. Goldschmidt, Reed College, president; Kline Swygard, Oregon State College, vice-president; Jonathan R. Cunningham, Spokane County, Washington, Planning Commission, secretary-treasurer. New members of the executive council include: Daniel O. Ogden, Jr., Washington State College; Boyd A. Martin, University of Idaho; and Waldo Schumacher, University of Oregon. Among the resolutions adopted by the Association was the following: "Resolved that the American Political Science Association hold its annual meeting in 1956 and each fifth year thereafter in one of the eleven Western states." Copies of this resolution were sent to the executive council of the American Political Science Association for consideration.

Political science teachers of institutions which form the University Center in Georgia (Agnes Scott College, Emory University, Oglethorpe University, the Georgia Institute of Technology, and the University of Georgia) assembled for the first time in May on the campus of Emory University. Professor Cullen B. Gosnell of Emory was elected chairman of the group. Morris W. H. Collins, Jr., assistant professor of political science at the University of Georgia, was elected vice-chairman, and Catherine S. Sims, associate professor of history and political science at Agnes Scott College, was elected secretary. Plans were made for the group to assemble at least twice each year to discuss common problems faced in the teaching of political science in the University Center institutions.

The Sixth Annual Conference of the William Edgar Borah Outlawry of War Foundation on "The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace" was held at the University of Idaho on March 18, 1953. The attention of the conference was directed to the Mutual Security and Technical Assistance Programs as positive projects in solving the problems of war and peace. A paper by William L. Shirer, entitled "America's Role in Building Global Prosperity and Peace," was presented to the Foundation. "Building Peace and Prosperity in Asia" was the subject of a second address delivered by Kenneth Lindsay, and H. L. Keenleyside, Director-General of the Technical Assistance Administration, United Nations, also addressed the conference on "The Impending Crisis." More than one hundred students and scholars representing study and interest groups through the entire Northwest attended the conference. Following each address there was a series of panel discussions relating to the major subject under consideration.

The department of political science and the Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois, jointly sponsored a two-session institute on "The Illinois General Assembly" during the latter part of April. The principal speakers were Warren L. Wood, Speaker, and Paul Powell, Minority Leader, of the House of Representatives; and George E. Drach, Majority Whip, and William J. Lynch, Minority Leader, of the Illinois State Senate. The purpose of the institute was to promote a better understanding on the part of University students of legislative procedure and of the role of political parties in the General Assembly.

A Management Conference was held June 4–5, 1953, at the University of New Mexico under the joint sponsorship of the University, the Society for Public Administration, and the Federal Personnel Council. Harold O. Ried of the University of New Mexico was the presiding chairman and Edward P. Ancona was the chairman of the committee on arrangements. Principal speakers were: Tom L. Popejoy, president of the University of New Mexico; Wallace S. Sayre, City College of New York; Milton M. Mandell, U. S. Civil Service Commission; Paul R. Beall, Air Research and Development Command at Baltimore; Elwood M. Brooks, president of the Central Bank and Trust Company of Denver; T. E. Shea, general manager of the Sandia Corporation at Albuquerque; Albert H. Rosenthal, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Denver; and H. N. Oldham, operating manager of the Southern Union Gas Company, Dallas. The theme of the conference concerned human relations in management, especially as it influences policy formation. Because of heavy attendance, active support from both public and private organizations, and grass-root demand, the University of New Mexico intends to make the conference an annual event and to expand its program of conferences and related activities in the social sciences.

The problem of fitting lawyers, engineers and other "specialists" for important managerial positions in both industry and government was discussed during a special six-weeks executive development conference, sponsored by the School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell University. John J. Corson, manager of the Washington office of McKinsey and Company and former director of the U. S. Employment Service, directed the program, with the assistance of Richard E. Neustadt, assistant professor of public administration, School of Business and Public Administration. The teaching staff was drawn both from the faculty of the School and from outside specialists. The latter included: James D. Mooney, president of the F. L. Jacobs Company and formerly president of General Motors Overseas Corporation; James M. Mitchell, former U. S. Civil Service Commissioner and now deputy assistant secretary for manpower and personnel in the Department of Defense; Earl Brooks, assistant dean of the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations; Carl J. Friedrich, professor of government at Harvard, and others. The group of twenty-five representatives of middle and top business and governmental management met together in a series of seminars from July 13 through August 22. Among the topics considered were policy formulation and administration, personnel and human relations, finance, economic and political trends, and managerial responsibility.

The Citizenship Clearing House for Southern New York held its first annual conference on "The University and Student Political Participation" on April 24–25 at the New York University Law Center. Representatives from fifteen colleges and universities in the Southern New York area attended and prominent persons holding public and party office participated in the proceedings. The principal address was delivered by the Honorable Emanuel Celler. Professor Ray F. Harvey, director of the Citizenship Clearing House for Southern New York, presided.

The annual meetings of the Social Science Section of the Ohio College Association were held in Columbus, March 19–20. Harvey C. Mansfield, president for 1952–53, arranged the program, featuring a panel discussion of movie censorship in Ohio; papers by Professors John F. Cady of Ohio University and Kazuo Kawai of the Ohio State University, on current problems in Southeast Asia and in Japan; and a debate on the role of the minority party in national politics in which Professor Norton E. Long of Western Reserve University participated. Professor Donovan F. Emch, University of Toledo, was elected vice-president for the coming year and Mona Fletcher, Kent State University, secretary-treasurer.

The Pennsylvania State College held its Second Institute of World Affairs and International Cooperation during the summer session, June 30 to August 8. A three-credit course on International Understanding, open to graduate and advanced undergraduate students, was given by Dr. Richard Heindel, on leave from his position as deputy director of the UNESCO Relations Staff of the Department of State in Washington, D. C. The Institute offered several supplementary programs, including a three-day conference on the Point Four and Technical Assistance Programs; weekly lectures by prominent specialists, including Henri Bonnet, French Ambassador to the United States, and Professors Hans J. Morgenthau, Otto Klineberg, and F. S. C. Northrop; weekly round tables by Penn State faculty members on various problems of international affairs; and special programs featuring international films, music, and art. Elton Atwater, associate professor of political science at the Pennsylvania State College, was the general coordinator of the Institute activities.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

The University of Puerto Rico is currently celebrating its 50th anniversary and several political scientists have been active in this event. The President of the University is Dr.

Jaime Benitez, who received his professional training in political science at the University of Chicago. Professor Lindsay Rogers of Columbia University is a member of the University's board of trustees. Among those to whom honorary degrees were given in the March and June convocations were President Grayson Kirk of Columbia University and Professor Rexford Tugwell of the University of Chicago. Marshall Dimock, a visiting professor at the University during the second semester of 1953, gave a public address on "The Place of the University in the Community" as part of the 50th anniversary ceremonies.

This University now has a total enrollment of around 12,000 students, a budget of nearly $11,000,000, and a faculty of 600. Most of this rapid increase has occurred during the past ten to fifteen years. The University now has first-class medical and law schools and professional schools of every kind. Like the University of Chicago and similar institutions, the University of Puerto Rico is divided structurally into divisions dealing with the social sciences, the physical sciences, the humanities, etc.; these divisions are served by a general college emphasizing integrated knowledge and broad cultural preparation. An unusual feature is the integration of most of the professional schools with the divisions of the University with which they are logically associated. Thus, for example, the Schools of Public Administration, Social Work, and the Institute of Labor Relations are headed by supervisory officials, but all report to, and have their policies determined by, the Dean of the Social Sciences, Dr. Pedro Muñoz Amato. Dean Muñoz Amato was trained in political science at the Universities of Chicago and Harvard and was the director of the research staff that helped draft the Commonwealth Constitution of Puerto Rico. He is presently a visiting professor at the Vargas School of Public Administration in Rio de Janeiro, which operates in conjunction with the United Nations program in public administration.

Another feature of the University of Puerto Rico is its Social Science Research Center, headed by Dr. Millard Hansen, formerly of the University of Chicago. This integrated research program has a current annual budget of approximately $100,000 and is engaged in basic research which is related to Puerto Rico's development program. Samples of recent studies are labor relations (Lloyd Reynolds, Yale), retail distribution problems (J. K. Galbraith, Harvard), family life in Puerto Rico (Reuben Hill, University of North Carolina), and population studies (Paul K. Hatt, Northwestern University, and Melvin Tumin, Princeton University). Several of the major continental foundations, such as Carnegie and Rockefeller, have been active in the support of this work. Recently the director of the Center, Millard Hansen, edited a special issue of *The Annals* entitled, "Puerto Rico, A Study in Democratic Development."

The University has also become one of the main world centers of Point Four training. During the past few years, students from no less than fifty-two countries have done work at the University of Puerto Rico. In addition, close relations are being established with Latin-American countries. During the current semester, for example, there are students from Bolivia, Brazil, and other countries of Latin America, studying in the School of Public Administration. This School has ten full-time instructors and an additional five who are drawn from the government, making it one of the largest programs of its kind in the United States.—MARSHALL E. DIMOCK.

A team of historians and political scientists at the Center for Research on World Political Institutions, Princeton University, has undertaken an exploration of the process of political integration. The method used by the team involves historical case studies in six areas where major processes of political integration or its opposite have taken place, plus the development of an analytical framework to serve as a guide in the search for relevant data in each case and as a basis for deriving common inferences from the several cases. The areas studied are the United States, the United Kingdom, Italy, Germany, the Swedish-Norwegian union, and the Austro-Hungarian empire.

The political scientists are Professor Richard Van Wagenen, director of the Center, and Professor Karl W. Deutsch, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who is currently spending a year at Princeton on this project. The historians are Professors Robert A. Kann of Rutgers University, Raymond E. Lindgren of the University of Wisconsin, Sidney A. Burrell of Barnard College, and Maurice duP. Lee of Princeton, and Dr. Martin Lichterman and Dr. Francis L. Loewenheim. Meetings have been held with scholars of various disciplines on the Princeton faculty and elsewhere while the case studies are proceeding.

The intermediate object of the study is to obtain clues from history as to how independent political units became so closely integrated into larger units that they formed security-communities, in the sense that war ceased within their borders. The ultimate object is to apply these findings to the present problem of international organization, including at the outset the special problem of Western European integration.

The University of Minnesota has received a grant from the Citizenship Clearing House, affiliated with the Law Center of New York University, for the establishment of a local citizenship clearing house in Minneapolis. The local program will be in charge of Professors A. N. Christensen and Arthur E. Naftalin.

The Bureau of Public Administration at the University of Georgia conducted a four-weeks basic training course for highway patrolmen in May and June, 1953. This was the first step in what is projected as a comprehensive police training program at the University of Georgia.

The Carnegie Corporation has announced a grant of $90,000 to Northwestern University to be expended during a three-year period in development of the graduate and undergraduate curriculum in political science. The grant was made after submission of a statement of plans for curricular revision which was prepared by a committee of the political science department under the chairmanship of Professor Roland Young. The preliminary statement of the department's goals in curricular revision include:

For graduate instruction and training: (1) Greater emphasis on a comprehensive preparation as distinguished from narrower specialization in the requirements for the Ph.D. degree; (2) the preparation of a small number (perhaps four) core courses for graduate students only, all of which will ordinarily be taken by each candidate for the Ph.D., and which collectively will examine the main items of literature and confront the student with main areas of inquiry in government and politics; (3) planning of seminars which provide training for empirical inquiry and theoretic analysis in various problem-areas of political science; (4) a more satisfactory relating of instruction and training in political science to graduate instruction and training in other social science departments of the University; and (5) a more fruitful utilization of the results of contemporary research and thoughtful writing in the instruction and training of graduate students.

For undergraduate instruction and training: (1) Generally, the replacement of courses of narrower or more specialized subject matter by a smaller number of courses of more central concern; (2) the preparation of a foundation course for undergraduates which supplies fundamental knowledge and theory and develops the concepts which appear to be most essential for examining political phenomena, whether in later courses or in non-academic situations; (3) the preparation of courses for seniors which require them to utilize their instruction in political science and other subjects in examination of significant contemporary problems; and (4) a more satisfactory adjustment of attention to individual student needs with the exigencies of large student enrollments.

The funds made available by Carnegie Corporation will make possible, among other things, the following: (1) replacement of the Northwestern faculty in its teaching obligations while they are engaged in curriculum development; (2) bringing to Northwestern for limited periods of time persons with significant academic and non-academic experience who will contribute to curriculum development and the current teaching and training program; (3) conferences in which small groups examine problems in graduate and undergraduate instruction and training; and (4) visits by Northwestern faculty to other colleges, universities, and non-academic centers where important developments are taking place in teaching and research.

The American University has announced a second unit of the Washington Semester, a cooperative honors program administered by the American University in cooperation with other colleges throughout the country. Colleges and universities now participating in the Washington Semester are: Alfred, Augustana, Boston University, Cornell College, Davidson, Drew, Earlham, Grinnell, Hunter, Lake Forest, Monmouth, Nebraska Wesleyan, Park, Pennsylvania College for Women, Rockford, Rollins, Shepherd, Simpson, Stetson, Swarthmore, Redlands, Valparaiso, Wabash, Washington College, and Western Reserve. Robert L. Goostree has been appointed assistant professor of political science and public administration to serve as academic director of Unit II of the Washington Semester. William E. Biggs will continue as academic director of Unit I. Lowell H. Hattery will serve as coordinator of the program.

CONGRESSIONAL INTERNE PROGRAM

After an intensive series of screenings and interviews by twelve regional boards throughout the country, six Congressional Internes were selected in mid-June to start their work in Washington, D. C. on September 1. This is the first year that the Association has sponsored a Congressional Interne program, which is being carried forward on a three-year experimental basis. Competition for the next group of Internes will be announced early in 1954.

Those named in the first group of Congressional Internes are the following:

Mrs. Marie S. Carl, St. Augustine, Fla., is a graduate of Clark College of Atlanta, Ga. She received a master's degree from the University of Michigan and an LL.B. from the Yale School of Law.

Abraham Holtzman, Los Angeles, Calif., is a graduate of Los Angeles City College, and also received an A.B. and an M.A. from the University of California at Los Angeles. He received his Ph.D. from Harvard and is an instructor in the department of government at Dartmouth College.

Mavis A. Mann, Morgantown, W. Va., is a graduate of West Virginia University and received a Ph.D. from the University of North Carolina. She is an assistant professor of government at West Virginia University.

Harry H. Ransom, Sewanee, Tenn., is a graduate of Vanderbilt University, with an M.A. degree from Princeton. He was an instructor in the department of political science at Vassar College from 1948–1952, and is completing his Ph.D. at Princeton.

Ben F. Reeves, Bowling Green, Ky., is a graduate of the University of Kentucky, and completed a year of graduate work in political science at that university. He is a political reporter for the *Louisville Courier-Journal.*

H. Bradford Westerfield, Hamden, Conn., is a graduate of Yale with highest honors. He received his Ph.D. from Harvard, where he is now an instructor in the department of government.

The following alternates were announced, in addition to the six successful candidates:

Otto P. C. Press, Minneapolis, Minn., is a graduate of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, with a master's degree from the University of Minnesota.

Robert S. Friedman, Urbana, Illinois, is a graduate of Johns Hopkins, and is an assistant in political science at the University of Illinois.

Rob Roy Ratliff, Joplin, Mo., is a graduate of American University, where he also holds a master's degree and has been a lecturer in the department of political science.

Marvin A. Harder, Wichita, Kansas, is a graduate of the University of Wichita and has a master's degree from Columbia. He is an assistant professor of political science at the University of Wichita.

Francis M. Carney, Los Angeles, Calif., is a graduate of the University of Southern California, with a master's degree from Stanford. He is a teaching assistant at the University of California at Los Angeles.

The six Congressional Internes appeared on various panel discussions at the Annual Meeting of the Association. Their first two months will be spent in handling inquiries at the Legislative Reference Service and in getting an intensive orientation in the problems to face them in their later work with congressional committees and in the offices of House and Senate Members. Considerable time is being spent in meetings with Capitol Hill officials, and in acquainting the Internes with the literature with which they will deal in their work. Weekly seminar meetings are being held throughout the year, enabling the Internes to discuss their varied experiences and meet with congressional staff and other experts.

Three of the Internes are being assigned to House Committees and three to Senate Committees, according to their own preferences and the availability of openings. The demand from both committees and individual members of Congress has far exceeded the supply of Internes. About March 1, 1954 the Internes will commence their work in the offices of individual Members of Congress, those having worked with House Committees being assigned to Senators and vice versa. By chance rather than design, assignments are being made to three Democratic and three Republican Members.—KENNETH W. HECHLER.

The library of the John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation has been donated to the University of California (Los Angeles) and will be administered by the

Bureau of Government Research. Valuable materials in the library include the Franklin Hichborn Collection on California legislation and politics, and papers on direct legislation, state and local planning, and municipal government in California.

The Institute for Social Research of Oslo, Norway, has announced the joint award of first prize to Quincy Wright, of the University of Chicago, and Fred Cottrell, of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, for essays submitted on the subject "The Relevance of Research to a Science of Peace." The amount of the award was ten thousand kroner. The contest was open to scholars in all parts of the world and many areas were represented in the entries. The winning essays will be published shortly.

James K. Pollock, professor and chairman of the department of political science at the University of Michigan, assisted by three members of the departmental staff, Henry Bretton, Daniel S. McHargue and Frank Grace, directed a field survey of the 1953 Bundestag elections in the German Federal Republic. The project, financed by a foundation grant, was designed both for the purpose of studying a crucial election in a pivotal country and to provide training in the techniques of field research in the area of parties and elections.

At the request of the Air Force ROTC, Rowland Egger of the University of Virginia, Robert S. Rankin of Duke University, and Kenneth W. Hechler of the Association office, spent May 4–6 at the Air University reviewing text material for the Air ROTC course in "International Tensions and Security Organizations."

Charles S. Ascher, chairman of the department of political science, Brooklyn College, and associate director, Public Administration Clearing House, during the summer participated in a round table of the International Political Science Association on comparative administration in Paris; in the Congress of the International Union of Local Authorities in Vienna, where he talked on "The U. N. and Local Government"; and the Congress of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences in Istanbul, where he served as rapporteur for a session on "Ethics of the Civil Service."

Arnold Brecht, of the New School for Social Research, who had been a ministerial director in German ministries from 1921 to 1933, has been honored by the Bonn Government through a retroactive appointment to state secretary (retired) in recognition of his services to the Weimar Republic.

William S. Carpenter, professor of politics, Princeton University, addressed the New York Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration at Albany on February 11, 1953, on "Current Problems of Civil Service Reform."

Asher N. Christensen, of the University of Minnesota, served during the week of June 1–6, 1953, as one of a panel of political scientists, representing the field of American government, in an exploration of the possibilities of adult education through television facilities at Iowa State College.

Karl W. Deutsch, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has been elected a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in the field of political science. In February he moved to Princeton University for a year to work with a group of historians and political scientists at the Center for Research on World Political Institutions. During the spring he gave a number of talks on communication theory and social science at the University of Toronto, Columbia University, and other institutions.

Oscar Jászi, professor emeritus of political science at Oberlin College and former chairman of the department, was awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws by that institution at the 120th anniversary commencement exercises on June 8. The citation was as follows: "Oscar Jászi, staunch champion of the rights of man, wise and experienced author and scholar in the theory and practice of state-craft, beloved and inspiring teacher of generations of Oberlin students: in the name of Oberlin College I confer upon you the degree of Doctor of Laws."

Walter H. C. Laves, vice-president of the Governmental Affairs Institute, has been appointed secretary-general of a conference on "Organization and Administration of Public Enterprise in the Industrial Field" to be held under the auspices of the Economic Cooperation Administration for the Far East. The conference, jointly sponsored by the UN Technical Assistance Administration, ECAFE, and the International Institute of Administrative Sciences, will be held in Rangoon in March of 1954. Mr. Laves has been in South Asia during July of this year to consult with the governments of the area concerning their needs and interests in the Conference.

Alpheus Thomas Mason, McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence, Princeton University, spent the summer of 1953 at the University of Tokyo giving lectures on American political thought before the Seminar in American Studies, under the joint auspices of the University of Tokyo and Stanford University.

Dean E. McHenry, professor of political science at the University of California (Los Angeles), delivered an address on "Professors and Politics" at the Conference on Citizen Participation in Politics held at International House, Berkeley, California, in April, 1953. The University of California (Berkeley) was host institution to the conference, which was sponsored by the Citizenship Clearing House.

Norman D. Palmer, professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, who is now in India as a visiting professor on a Fulbright grant, delivered a series of twelve lectures on international affairs at Lucknow University during the last week in February, under the auspices of the law faculty and the department of political science. In March, he visited the University of Ceylon and Madras University under the auspices of UNESCO. At each of these universities he gave lectures and consulted with officials of the administration and with members of the faculty. Later in March he went to West Pakistan, where he consulted with administration officials and faculty members of the University of the Punjab, Forman Christian College, and Government College in Lahore; he delivered a lecture at the Law College of the University of Peshawar, and participated in a four-day "Colloquium on Learning in the Twentieth Century" at Peshawar University, under the joint sponsorship of the University and the United States Education Foundation/Pakistan.

George A. Peek, Jr., assistant professor of political science at the University of Michigan, was the 1953 recipient of the 1919 Literary Class Award which is given annually to the outstanding teacher among the junior professors in the College of Literature, Science and the Arts. The award carries a stipend of $1000.

Frances Perkins, former Secretary of Labor (1933–1945) and U. S. Civil Service Commissioner (1946–1953), served as visiting lecturer at the University of Illinois during the period from April 13 to May 22, 1953. Miss Perkins appeared under the joint sponsorship of the department of political science, the Institute of Government and Public Affairs, the School of Social Work and the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations. In addition to one general university lecture on "The Roosevelt I Knew," Miss Perkins conducted fourteen seminar sessions on subjects in the general fields of federal civil service, labor, social security, and political pressures on administration.

Lindsay Rogers, of Columbia University, delivered the Walgreen Lectures at the University of Chicago during the spring of 1953.

Donald C. Stone, former special assistant to the Director for Mutual Security, has been appointed President of Springfield College, Springfield, Massachusetts.

Eric Voegelin has recently been designated a Boyd Professor, a newly created category of professorships at Louisiana State University for recognizing distinguished and outstanding services to scholarship.

Paul W. Wager, professor of political science at the University of North Carolina, has been elected to the Chapel Hill Board of Aldermen for a term of four years.

APPOINTMENTS AND STAFF CHANGES

Henry J. Abraham has been promoted to assistant professor in political science at the University of Pennsylvania.

Robert Agger, recently of the University of Oregon, has been given a one-year appointment as instructor in political science at the University of North Carolina.

Benjamin Akzin, Herbert Samuel Professor of Political Science and Constitutional Law and Dean of the Law School at the Hebrew

University in Jerusalem, filled a visiting professorship at the University of Michigan during the summer of 1953. He lectured on the government of Israel and participated in public law seminars in the University of Michigan School of Law.

Vincent M. Barnett, Jr., who has served during the past two years in the American Embassy in Rome, has returned to Williams College as professor and chairman of the department of political science.

George I. Blanksten, of Northwestern University, is on leave of absence until January, 1954, participating in a study of the effect of Point Four programs upon the countries of Latin America. This investigation is being financed by the Ford Foundation and is being directed by Professor Theodore W. Schultz of the University of Chicago.

W. Theodore Bluhm, of the University of Rochester, has accepted an appointment at Brown University as instructor of political science.

Frank R. Brandenburg, instructor in political science at the University of Pennsylvania, has been awarded the Frederic Courtland Penfield Travelling Fellowship and the Henry L. and Grace Doherty Fellowship for Research on Political Parties in Mexico. During 1953–54 he will be on leave from the University of Pennsylvania to spend the year in Mexico.

Ben G. Burnett, formerly a member of the faculty at Kent State University, has accepted a position as instructor of political science at Whittier College, beginning in September, 1953. His work will include courses in Latin-American government and politics.

James M. Burns has been promoted to the rank of full professor at Williams College.

Paul Camp, personnel adviser to the Surgeon General, U. S. Public Health Service, has been promoted to the rank of adjunct professor of public administration at the American University.

William N. Cassella has been awarded the National Municipal League Staff Fellowship for 1953–54 and is on leave from the department of political science at the University of Missouri for that period.

H. Paul Castleberry, assistant professor of political science at the State College of Washington, will spend the 1953–54 academic year at American University in Cairo under a Fulbright award lecturing in the field of international relations.

David T. Cattell has been appointed instructor in political science at the University of California (Los Angeles).

James C. Charlesworth, professor of political science and supervisor of the educational program of the Institute of Local and State Government at the University of Pennsylvania, assumed the presidency of the American Academy of Political and Social Science on June 1. He was elected to this post upon the retirement of Dr. Ernest Minor Patterson, internationally noted economist who served as president of the Academy since 1930. During the past several years Professor Charlesworth has been identified with the work of the Academy as associate editor of *The Annals*.

John L. Chase, recently of Brown University, has been given a one-year appointment as visiting lecturer in political science at the University of North Carolina.

Harwood L. Childs, professor of politics, Princeton University, has been granted a year's leave of absence to accept an appointment to the faculty of the School of Public Administration in Rio de Janeiro for 1953–54. The School was established by the United Nations in cooperation with the Brazilian Government and the Vargas Foundation in 1952 in connection with the Technical Assistance program of the U.N. Professor Childs will give lectures and seminars in government public relations.

James B. Christoph, instructor in political science at the University of Minnesota, has been granted a Fulbright award for a year's study at the London School of Economics. He plans to study the political rights of state workers in Great Britain.

Dorothy I. Cline, assistant professor of government at the University of New Mexico, was recently appointed a member of the newly created Advisory Board to the New Mexico Land Commissioner's Office.

Morris H. Cohen has been promoted to associate professor of government at Clark University. Mr. Cohen, who returned to Clark in the fall of 1952 after a year in Washington,

D. C. and Chicago on a Ford Foundation grant, was director of a program of a team of civic leaders from Neumuenster, Germany, who spent two weeks in March, 1953 in Worcester under the sponsorship of the Governmental Affairs Institute.

Joseph D. Cooper, executive director, Salary Stabilization Board, is serving as a professorial lecturer in public administration at the American University.

Brownlee S. Corrin has been reappointed to the staff of the political science department of Goucher College. During 1953–54, he will present a course in politics using the internship technique in political party offices and civic organizations in the Baltimore area.

Edward S. Corwin, formerly of Princeton University, has accepted an appointment as visiting professor on the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research. During the second semester of 1953–54, Professor Corwin will teach at Whittier College where he will offer work in contemporary aspects of national constitutional law.

L. Gray Cowan, assistant professor of government at Columbia University, has been granted a two-years' leave of absence to undertake a study of comparative colonial administration in the British, French and Belgian territories of Central Africa.

Winston W. Crouch, University of California (Los Angeles), has been named President of the Los Angeles County Civil Service Commission. Professor Crouch has also been appointed to the board of trustees of the John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation.

Robert F. Cushman has resigned his assistant professorship at the Ohio State University to become associate professor at New York University, where he will give the graduate courses in public law at Washington Square.

A. P. Daggett, of Bowdoin College, was a visiting professor at Columbia University during the summer session.

Melvin D. Davidoff, head, Research and Analysis, Test Development Section, U. S. Civil Service Commission, is serving as a professorial lecturer in public administration at the American University.

James C. Davies, Carnegie Fellow in Political Science at the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, has been appointed assistant professor of political science at the California Institute of Technology.

Herbert A. Deane has been appointed assistant professor of government at Columbia University.

John T. Dempsey, who has spent the past two years in graduate work at the University of Michigan, has rejoined the staff of the department of political science at the University of Detroit.

Nicolas de Rochefort is serving as a professorial lecturer in public administration at the American University.

Conley H. Dillon, who has been on leave in Washington with the Office of Price Stabilization, resumed his duties in June as professor and head of the department of political science at Marshall College.

Richard W. Dodge, who has recently completed his doctorate at the University of Michigan, has been appointed to an instructorship in the department of social studies at Case Institute of Technology.

Paul S. Dull resumed his duties in September at the University of Oregon after a year's sabbatical leave. Professor Dull spent the major part of the past year in Japan studying the impact of the war, occupation, and recent political changes in local government in Japan.

John Eaves, Jr. has been awarded a Ford Foundation fellowship to study at the School of African and Oriental Studies, University of London.

Charles P. Edwards, formerly of the University of Connecticut and Tufts College, is teaching this year in the department of government at the University of New Hampshire.

Harold E. Engle, who is completing his dissertation for the doctorate at Columbia University, has joined the staff of the Center for Research on World Political Institutions at Princeton University for the year 1953–54 as research assistant. Mr. Engle was with the Center on a half-time basis during the past year.

David G. Farrelly, assistant professor of political science at the University of California (Los Angeles), has received a grant from the Social Science Research Council to supervise an undergraduate student project on California electoral behavior.

Milton Feder has been appointed predoctoral instructor in political science at the University of Michigan.

Russell H. Fifield, associate professor of political science at the University of Michigan, who is spending a sabbatical year studying foreign policy in the Philippines and Southeast Asia, has been appointed to a consultantship on this area in the U. S. Department of State.

Edgar S. Furniss, Jr., assistant professor of politics, Princeton University, has returned from a year in Paris under a Social Science Research Council Faculty Fellowship and a Bicentennial Preceptorship. While in France he worked on particular aspects of the French foreign policy under the Fourth Republic.

Peter Gay has received an appointment as assistant professor in Columbia College.

John J. George, professor of political science at Rutgers University, was a visiting professor at Emory University during the summer quarter, 1953.

Frank K. Gibson, formerly an instructor in political science at the University of North Carolina, has been appointed to a research assistantship in the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of Virginia.

Juanita Gibson, instructor in the School of Public Administration at Florida State College, spent the academic year 1952–53 on work toward the doctorate at the University of Michigan.

E. Drexel Godfrey has been promoted to an assistant professorship in political science at Williams College.

Ralph M. Goldman, who has been staff and editorial associate on the American Political Science Association's Cooperative Research Project on Convention Delegations, has been appointed to the staff of the Brookings Institution in Washington, D. C.

Charles H. Goodman, research psychologist, Department of the Air Force, has been promoted to the rank of adjunct professor of public administration at the American University.

D. Thurston Griggs, recently a lecturer in the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, joined the faculty of Drew University in September as assistant professor of international relations.

Bertram M. Gross, research consultant to the Public Affairs Institute and legislative consultant to Senator James E. Murray of Montana, will serve for the next two years as planning adviser on the Economic Advisory Staff in the Office of the Prime Minister of Israel, commencing in July, 1953.

C. P. Harper has been advanced to a full professorship in political science at Marshall College.

Henry C. Hart, of the University of Wisconsin, has received a Ford Foundation grant for the year 1953–54 to study river-valley developments in India.

Ray F. Harvey has been appointed head of the department of government in the Graduate School of Arts and Science of New York University.

Alexander Heard, of the University of North Carolina, will be released from the major portion of his teaching duties during the next two years to make a study of "Money in Politics" which is being financed by a grant to the Institute for Research in Social Science by the Stern Foundation.

John G. Heinberg, professor and chairman of the department of political science, University of Missouri, was a visiting professor of political science during the 1953 summer session at the University of Nebraska.

Charles M. Hersh has been promoted to an associate professorship in political science and public administration at the American University.

Edward J. Heubel, of the University of Minnesota, has been appointed to an instructorship in political science at Reed College.

Chesney Hill, professor of political science at the University of Missouri, has been granted leave for the fall semester to join the civilian faculty of the National War College, Washington, D. C., where he will be a member of the international affairs committee.

John Perry Horlacher has been appointed chairman of the department of political science at the University of Pennsylvania to succeed Dr. Charles C. Rohlfing. Dr. Horlacher has been on leave of absence for two years as chairman of the Regional Wage Stabilization Board in Philadelphia.

Charles D. Hounshell, assistant professor of political science at Emory University, will be on leave during 1953–54 under a Ford Foundation grant to study international relations at Princeton University.

Ronald F. Howell, who received his degree from the Johns Hopkins University in 1952, and has been in Europe during the past year studying European federation, has accepted an instructorship at Emory University for the academic year 1953–54.

Ralph K. Huitt, of the University of Wisconsin, has received a Faculty Fellowship for the year 1953–54 from the Fund for the Advancement of Education. He will spend a year in Washington studying the Congress.

Charles S. Hyneman has been appointed chairman of the department of political science at Northwestern University for a two-year period, beginning September 1, 1953.

David L. Jickling has been appointed instructor in the department of government and international relations at Carleton College.

Jack T. Johnson, who had been on leave of absence from the department of political scieince at the state University of Iowa, has resigned and will continue in his post with the Office of Civilian Defense in Washington, D. C.

Frank Jones, who was on a leave of absence with the Office of the High Command in Germany, resumed his duties in July, 1953, as associate professor of political science at the University of Utah.

Joseph E. Kallenbach has been advanced to a full professorship in political science at the University of Michigan.

Herbert Kaufman, recently a lecturer in government at the City College of New York, has been appointed to an assistant professorship in political science at Yale University.

David C. Knapp has been appointed assistant professor of government at the University of New Hampshire to teach in the areas of public administration and state and local government.

Martin Kriesberg, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, is serving as a professorial lecturer in public administration at the American University.

Allan A. Kuusisto, assistant professor of government at the University of New Hampshire, will be in Finland during the next academic year on a Fulbright research grant.

Robert Lacour-Gayet, head of the department of history and government of St. Johns University, has been chosen president of the *Société des Professeurs Français en Amérique.*

Lionel H. Laing has been promoted to a full professorship in political science at the University of Michigan.

Robert S. Lancaster, assistant professor of political science at the University of the South, has been appointed Dean of Men in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Robert E. Lane, assistant professor of political science at Yale University, has been awarded a Faculty Fellowship by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, and will be on leave of absence for the academic year 1953–54.

John W. Lederle resumed his duties in September as professor of political science and director of the Institute of Public Administration at the University of Michigan. During the past year he served as director of the Institute of Public Administration at the University of the Philippines.

Carl Leiden returned to Marshall College in September after spending a year at the University of Peshawar, Pakistan, on a Fulbright appointment. He has been promoted to an associate professorship in political science.

Werner Levi, University of Minnesota, spent the summer in Europe where he taught an international seminar in France and gave a paper before a meeting of the International Sociological Association in Liege.

Gordon K. Lewis, formerly of the University of California (Los Angeles), taught in the 1953 summer session at Michigan State College.

Ernest M. Linton retired on July 1, after having served in the department of government at Indiana University for 40 years. Professor Linton began his service in the department as the first graduate assistant when the department was separated from the department of history and political science in 1914. During recent years his teaching has been concentrated in the field of international relations.

Harvey C. Mansfield, on leave from the Ohio State University, is a member of the visiting civilian professorial staff at the National War College, Washington, D. C., for the fall term.

Edward T. McCormick, president of the American Stock Exchange and former Securities and Exchange Commissioner, has accepted an appointment as a special lecturer in finance for 1953–54 in the School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell University.

William M. McGovern, of the department of political science at Northwestern University, returned on September 1 from a year's leave of absence which he spent as a member of the faculty of the Naval War College at Newport, Rhode Island.

William Reynolds McIntyre, a graduate student in political science at the University of Michigan, has been awarded the Exchange Fellowship and will attend Queen's University, Belfast, Ireland, during the academic year 1953–54.

Edward McWhinney, lecturer in law and political science at Yale University from 1951 to 1953, has been appointed assistant professor of political science at that institution.

Robert O. McWilliams, who recently completed his doctorate at the University of Michigan, has been appointed instructor in political science at Yale University.

Dwaine Marvick has been appointed to a part-time lectureship in political science at the University of Michigan for 1953–54. He will also serve as research associate in the Institute of Public Administration assigned to the Phoenix Project.

Wallace Mendelson, professor of political science at the University of Tennessee, has been granted a leave of absence for the 1953–54 academic year to serve as research assistant to Mr. Justice Frankfurter.

James W. Miller, of the political science department at Michigan State College, has been advanced to a full professorship.

Lyman Moore, executive officer, National Institute of Mental Health, is serving as a professorial lecturer in public administration at the American University.

Forrest D. Murden, Jr. returned to Columbia University in September as administrative assistant in the School of International Affairs after serving three years with the U. S. Mission to the United Nations.

James N. Murray, of the department of political science at Northwestern University, taught the summer session at Mexico City College, Mexico City, Mexico.

Fred W. Neal, assistant professor of political science at the University of Colorado, will be a visiting lecturer at the University of Michigan during 1953–54 while continuing work toward his doctorate in political science.

Rita W. Nealon, of New York University, has been appointed associate director of the Citizenship Clearing House for Southern New York.

H. C. Nixon has been promoted from lecturer to professor of political science at Vanderbilt University. He taught during the second half of the summer session at Duke University.

Clark Norton, professor of political science at DePauw University, taught at West Virginia University during the summer session.

Georges Parthemos, who recently received the doctorate at the University of North Carolina, joined the staff of the department of political science at the University of Georgia in September. He will teach courses in political theory and has assumed the editorship of the *Georgia Local Government Journal.*

Tibor Payzs, chairman of the department of political science at the University of Detroit, has been designated director of the newly established Center for Human Relations at that institution.

Roy V. Peel, past director of the Bureau of the Census, was appointed, on May 4, 1953, professor and head of the department of political science and director of the Institute of Government at the University of Utah.

Nathaniel Peffer is spending his sabbatical leave from Columbia University as a Fulbright lecturer at the University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.

Whitney T. Perkins, recently of the University of Denver, has accepted an appointment at Brown University as associate professor of political science.

J. Cass Phillips has been appointed professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania.

R. Vance Presthus, associate professor of political science at Michigan State College, taught in the 1953 summer session at San Diego State College.

Segundo V. Linares Quintana, until recently a professor at the Universities of La Plata and Buenos Aires, Argentina, is serving as Burton Craige Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of North Carolina during the fall semester.

Robert S. Rankin, professor and chairman of the department of political science at Duke University, was a visiting professor at Columbia University during the summer session.

Joseph M. Ray was appointed, effective June 1, 1953, as the first civilian chief of the Information and Education Branch, Personnel Services Division, Headquarters, United States Air Force. Dr. Ray is on leave from the University of Maryland, where he served as Dean of the College of Special and Continuation Services. He was formerly head of the department of government and politics at that university.

John S. Reshetar,, lecturer in politics at Princeton University, has been awarded a Faculty Fellowship by the Ford Foundation and will be on leave for the academic year 1953–54.

J. William Robinson, chairman of the department of political science and international relations at Whittier College, will be on sabbatical leave of absence during the school year 1953–54.

Jack W. Rodgers has been advanced from instructor to assistant professor of political science at the University of Nebraska.

Victor G. Rosenblum has returned to the University of California at Berkeley as assistant professor of political science and supervisor of the Office of American Institutions, after seven months in Washington as staff associate with the Governmental Affairs Institute.

Clinton Rossiter, of Cornell University, has been granted a Guggenheim fellowship for a study of conservative political thought, and will be on sabbatical leave for the academic year 1953–54.

E. E. Schattschneider, professor of government at Wesleyan University, has been appointed visiting lecturer at Yale University for the year 1953–54.

S. Rezazadeh Shafaq is serving as a visiting professor at Columbia University.

Chandler Shaw, professor and head of the department of history and political science at Bethany College, taught at West Virginia University during the summer session.

Hale T. Shenefield has returned to the Program Office of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs in Washington after a year as program officer with the ICA-IIAA in Santiago, Chile.

John C. Shover, manpower specialist, Office of Under Secretary of the Navy, is serving as a professorial lecturer in public administration at the American University.

Thomas W. Simons, of the State Department, will return to Columbia University in 1953–54 to lecture in the Center of Pakistan Studies.

Ralph Smuckler, of the political science department at Michigan State College, has been advanced to the rank of assistant professor.

Albert Somit has returned to New York University as associate professor of government and associate director of the Falk Program of Training in Active Citizenship. Professor Somit has just completed a tour of duty as Psychological Warfare Intelligence Officer with the United States Army in Europe.

O. Glenn Stahl, executive vice-chairman, Federal Personnel Council, has been promoted to the rank of adjunct professor of public administration at the American University.

Harold Stein, recently staff director of the Inter-University Case Program and consultant to the Public Administration Clearing House, has been appointed director of a three-year Twentieth Century Fund research project on civil-military relations. During the academic year 1953–54 he will also be visiting lecturer at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University.

John B. Stewart has received an appointment as assistant professor of government at Barnard College.

Paul D. Stewart has been promoted to the rank of associate professor of political science at Marshall College.

Albert L. Sturm resumed his duties in September as professor of political science at West Virginia University after serving as visiting professor at the University of Michigan the past year. During the summer months he was acting director of the Institute of Public Administration at Michigan.

Joseph L. Sutton has been appointed instructor in the department of government at Indiana University and will teach courses in world politics, Far Eastern government and Far Eastern political thought.

Rinehart John Swenson has retired from New York University after having served for thirty-three years. Professor Swenson was formerly chairman of the department of government in Washington Square College and head of the government department in the Graduate School of Arts and Science.

Sterling Tatsuji Takeuchi is spending his second year as visiting lecturer at Columbia University in the East Asian Institute and the department of public law and government.

Joseph Tanenhaus, instructor at Wells College, has been appointed assistant professor of government at New York University.

Philip B. Taylor, Jr. has been promoted to an assistant professorship in political science at the University of Michigan.

Morgan Thomas has been promoted to the rank of associate professor in the department of political science at the University of Michigan.

Kenneth W. Thompson, of the University of Chicago, accepted an appointment as associate professor of political science at Northwestern University, effective September, 1953.

Edwin Timbers, who recently completed his graduate work at the University of Michigan, has been appointed assistant professor of government at St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York.

Lois Torrence has been appointed assistant professor of political science at the American University.

R. J. Tresolini has been advanced to the rank of associate professor of political science at Lehigh University. During the summer, Professor Tresolini directed a research study carried on by students from funds provided by the Social Science Research Council.

Amry Vandenbosch, of the University of Kentucky, will hold the Burton Craige Professorship of Jurisprudence at the University of North Carolina during the spring semester of 1954.

Clement E. Vose, who has been an instructor in government at Beloit College during the past academic year, has accepted an appointment as assistant professor in the department of political science at Western Reserve University.

John C. Wahlke, of Amherst College, has accepted an appointment as assistant professor of political science at Vanderbilt University, effective September, 1953.

H. O. Waldby, on leave of absence from Florida State University, is serving for one year as visiting assistant professor of political science at the University of Michigan, assigned to the Institute of Public Administration, University of the Philippines.

Edwin W. Webber resigned his position as instructor of social sciences at Gulf Park College, Gulfport, Mississippi, to accept a research fellowship and to complete work for the Ph.D. degree at Tulane University.

Henry Wells, recently of Yale University, has been appointed visiting professor and research associate, School of Public Administration, University of Puerto Rico, for the academic year 1953–54.

Wilhelm Wengler, of the Free University of Berlin, was a visiting professor at Columbia University on a Ford Foundation grant during the spring session.

Ferdinand Westphalen, of the University of Vienna, was a visiting professor at Duke University during the spring term.

John P. Wheeler, Jr., formerly a graduate student at Florida State University and Syracuse University, has been appointed to an instructorship in the department of political science at Middlebury College.

Howard B. White, associate professor on the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research, has received an advanced studies grant from the Ford Foundation and will be on leave of absence during the academic year 1953–54.

Allen S. Whiting, of the political science department at Northwestern University, will spend next year studying Chinese government from basic points in Formosa and Hong Kong. His research is being financed by the Ford Foundation.

Robert F. Wilcox, of the department of political science at San Diego State College, taught in the 1953 summer session at Michigan State College.

Charlotte Williams, of Middle Tennessee State College, has accepted a one-year appointment as visiting lecturer in political science at Vanderbilt University to teach courses in public law and jurisprudence.

Henry Williams has accepted a graduate research fellowship at Columbia Law School for 1953–54.

Harold Winkler has been reappointed assistant professor of political science at the University of California (Berkeley).

S. Joseph Wodka, graduate student at the University of Michigan, was a member of the teaching staff in the department of history and government at Central Michigan College of Education at Mt. Pleasant during the summer term.

Francis D. Wormuth, professor of political science at the University of Utah, will be on leave during 1953–54 on a Ford Fellowship at Yale, observing relationships between the Law School and the social sciences in Yale's experimental program.

Paul Ylvisaker, of Swarthmore College, has been appointed staff director of the Inter-University Case Program, to succeed Harold Stein. The Program's headquarters were moved on July 1, 1953, from Washington to Swarthmore where Professor Ylvisaker will divide his time during the coming academic year between the teaching of political science and the case project.

Roland Young, of Northwestern University, was a visiting professor at Columbia University during the summer session.

Harold Zink, of the Ohio State University, was a visiting professor of political science at Duke University during the spring term.

IN MEMORIAM

Emerson David Fite, professor emeritus of political science at Vassar College, died in Poughkeepsie on May 17, 1953, at the age of seventy-nine.

Professor Fite was born in Marion, Ohio, in 1874. He received the bachelor's degree from Yale in 1897, and the doctor's degree from Harvard in 1905. Before coming to Vassar in 1913, Professor Fite had held teaching positions at the Mt. Hermon School, Harvard University, and Yale. He was Vassar's first professor of political science and he remained at Vassar until his retirement in 1944.

Professor Fite was a distinguished scholar. He broke new ground with his *Social and Industrial Conditions in the North during the Civil War* (1910) and *The Presidential Campaign of 1860* (1911). His *History of the United States*, published in 1916, was widely used in secondary schools in the United States and many an American schoolboy knew his "Fite." His other publications included *The United States* (with Archibald Freeman, 1923); *A Book of Old Maps* (1926); and *Government by Cooperation* (1932).

Professor Fite was not only a scholar; he was also an indefatigable public servant. He was elected Justice of the Peace in 1928; and from 1934 to 1943 he served the Poughkeepsie area as a member of the New York State Legislature. His outstanding achievement as Assemblyman was the Fite Civil Service Law.

Mr. Fite stimulated in his students a genuine interest in political science, particularly in the fields of international law and constitutional law. In his teaching of American government, because of his first-hand experience with politics and politicians, he was able to bring life and substance into the classroom.

He will long be remembered by his students and his colleagues as a good teacher, a gentle friend, a kindly neighbor, and a wise counselor.
—C. Gordon Post.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

At the Annual Meeting of The American Political Science Association in Washington, D. C., September 10–12, the following officers were elected for 1953–54, or took office: President, Ralph J. Bunche (United Nations); President-Elect, Charles McKinley (Reed College); Vice Presidents, Taylor Cole (Duke University), J. A. C. Grant (University of California, Los Angeles), Claudius O. Johnson (Washington State College); Secretary, Harvey C. Mansfield (The Ohio State University); Treasurer, Edward H. Litchfield (Cornell University); new members of the Council (two-year term): Manning J. Dauer (University of Florida), Earl Latham (Amherst College), Arnaud Leavelle (Stanford University), Dayton D. McKean (University of Colorado), J. Roland Pennock (Swarthmore College), C. Herman Pritchett (University of Chicago), Wallace S. Sayre (City College of New York), Dwight Waldo (University of California, Berkeley). Continuing members of the Council, elected last year, are Walter H. Bennett (University of Alabama), Hugh A. Bone (University of Washington), Robert A. Dahl (Yale University), David Fellman (University of Wisconsin), Victor Jones (Wesleyan University), Jack W. Peltason (University of Illinois), Emmette S. Redford (University of Texas), and Clinton Rossiter (Cornell University).

Copies of panel papers delivered at the Annual Meeting may be purchased for $.50 each by writing to the Washington Office.

ANNOUNCING

THE 1953 EDITION OF THE *DIRECTORY*

OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Available December, 1953

We are now accepting orders for the new *Directory* at the following rates:

For members, per copy:	For non-members, per copy:
$3.00 paper bound	$4.00 paper bound
$4.00 cloth bound	$6.00 cloth bound

Address orders to:

The American Political Science Association
1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

New

The Great Powers and Eastern Europe

John A. Lukacs, Chestnut Hill College and La Salle College

Never before has there been so broad and so penetrating a study of the critical area that is Eastern Europe. This book is distinguished by its vigorous style and its sound reliance on widely scattered primary sources in seven languages. Much of its material is here used in book form for the first time; a good deal of it is based on important documents made available since 1945. Avoiding a country-by-country treatment, the author employs a very interesting chronological-horizontal approach. The text is fully documented and contains an extensive bibliography.

Widely Used

Roots of Political Behavior

Introduction to Government and Politics

Richard Carlton Snyder and H. Hubert Wilson, Princeton University

This unique text represents a departure from the timeworn institutional approach to political science. It provides the opportunity for imaginative and stimulating teaching. It stimulates intelligent inquiry on the part of the student. The authors have brought together writings by recognized authorities which show how all the social sciences relate to political behavior. Their introductory discussions reflect keen understanding of political patterns. There is a brief commentary on each essay and its author. *Roots of Political Behavior* is available with either a cloth or a paper cover.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY
COLLEGE DIVISION, 55 Fifth Avenue, New York 3, N.Y.